

THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. SELWYN, D.D., REDHILL RECTORY, HAVANT,
to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XVII

SEPTEMBER, 1928

No. 99

EDITORIAL

BUNYAN'S tercentenary, which provides the motive of the first two articles in the present issue, reminds us of all that is most paradoxical in Christianity. That a tinker should have penned such golden prose as *Pilgrim's Progress* makes it not incredible, so far as style is concerned, that fishermen of Galilee, such as St. Peter and St. John, should have written the books that bear their names. That a prisoner should give to Christendom from his gaol such just and unembittered words takes us back to St. Paul for a like triumph of grace over circumstances. Deprived of all Dante's natural advantages, he ranks with the great Florentine as one of the masters of moral theology. And he has that same hallmark of genius, that he appeals to the child and to the grown man alike; we do not outgrow him. Not long since we saw a fascinating Sunday game which had been made by a father for his children. It was a form of the race-game, played with dice, sometimes called "Snakes and Ladders"; but in this case the snakes were replaced by obstacles out of *Pilgrim's Progress*, such as The Slough of Despond and Giant Despair, while the ladders were provided by Interpreter, the House Beautiful, the place where the crucifix was seen, etc. It is things like this that illustrate Bunyan's ever fresh appeal.

Of our two contributors on this subject, Dr. Workman is the author of the monumental *Life of Wyclif* which appeared last year, and few men have an ampler knowledge of the Puritan tradition in England; while Mr. Skipton's identification of Christian's road as part of the Pilgrim's Way is the work of an expert antiquary, and represents many years of study devoted to the problem.

We shall know by the end of this month what course the Bishops propose to pursue in regard to the Prayer Book. They have obviously now to stretch their *ius liturgicum* somewhat

further and more formally than has been the case hitherto; and we believe that they can count on the wisdom and moderation of clergy and people to give them every possible help. We hope that the case for the 1549 Canon will be carefully reconsidered: it would raise no questions of privilege, so far as printing is concerned, and it is desired by the great majority, we believe, of those who are dissatisfied with the present Canon. But the most obstinate difficulty is in connection with Reservation. The claim that the parish priest has an inherent right to reserve, without regard to the Bishop, seems to us one which the Church cannot possibly admit. On the other hand, the priest has a pastoral duty to provide for the needs of his people, and there are many clergy who cannot satisfy themselves that they are doing this without continuous Reservation. What is needed is that the Bishops should be free to be guided by experience. That claim was definitely made for them by the Archbishop in connection with the 1927 rubrics and regulations, and it needs to be reasserted. We cannot really tell where we are, until Reservation ceases to be a party issue and is recognized as a normal part of pastoral method in the case of many clergy. One of the first needs is to find out how large this number is; and the forthcoming synods might well be used to elicit this information.

So far as public opinion is concerned—and the Bishops are bound to bear it in mind—we do not believe that any serious difficulty will arise so long as the rights of congregations are not disturbed. The Blessed Sacrament is reserved for individuals who cannot attend the liturgy; its devotional appeal is to individuals, and is felt overwhelmingly by some but not at all by others; and the Church may not allow privileges which it grants to individuals to be so used as to injure the sentiments of congregations. The question arises especially in connection with ceremonial acts of reverence to the Reserved Sacrament during the course of ordinary services. In our judgment, these should be strictly limited to the times of entrance to, and exit from, the Church, on the ground that each service is a whole in itself and that the presence of the Reserved Sacrament is no integral part of it. This is particularly true in the case of the Eucharist, where the whole sequence of the rite is disturbed if attention is drawn to the Reserved Sacrament in the course of it. That is why it is far better that, wherever possible, the place of Reservation should be a side-chapel.

JOHN BUNYAN

I HAVE been asked by the Editor to send a short contribution from the Nonconformist standpoint on the great writer whose tercentenary has been recently celebrated. I find that I am rather late in the field. So many writers have already contributed excellent appreciations that there is little one can add. I am reminded, in fact, of a recent examination paper set at one of our universities in which the examiner, setting a question on Milton's "Lycidas" for youths under twenty, added that "no value would be given for any answer which was not original." When the results came out it was found that everyone had failed. Originality at this late hour of the day on a writer whose merits have been so canvassed is impossible. Nevertheless there are a few observations which it is still possible to make. I pass by the wonderful English, clear, undefiled and simple, of Bunyan's works, not only of his *Pilgrim's Progress* but also of his *Grace Abounding* and *Life and Death of Mr. Badman*. Is it possible anywhere in the English language to find more perfect sentences than those which could be picked out on every page in these works? I have always felt that we have the high-water mark of effective simplicity in such a telling sentence as the following, familiar to all readers as the opening words:

As I walked through the wilderness of this world, I lighted on a certain place where was a den, and laid me down in that place to sleep; and as I slept, I dreamed a dream. I dreamed, and, behold, I saw a man clothed with rags standing in a certain place, with his face from his own house, a book in his hand, and a great burden upon his back. I looked, and saw him open the book, and read therein; and, as he read, he wept and trembled; and, not being able longer to contain, he brake out with a lamentable cry, saying, "What shall I do?"

It is now more than a hundred years since Macaulay first pointed out that almost alone amongst all writers of allegories Bunyan's characters have a reality greater even than that of the men whom we meet day by day in the streets. Nothing is more remarkable, in fact, than the facility with which he coined abstract names that have become to us real persons, more real than many whose names are in a Directory. Take, for instance, the jury at the trial of Mr. Faithful:

Then went the jury out, whose names were Mr. Blindman, Mr. No-good, Mr. Malice, Mr. Love-lust, Mr. Live-loose, Mr. Heady, Mr. High-mind, Mr. Enmity, Mr. Liar, Mr. Cruelty, Mr. Hate-light, and Mr. Implacable; who every one gave in his private verdict against him amongst themselves, and afterwards unanimously concluded to bring him in guilty

before the judge. And first among themselves, Mr. Blindman, the foreman, said, I see clearly that this man is a heretic. Then said Mr. No-good, Away with such a fellow from the earth! Ay, said Mr. Malice, for I hate the very look of him. Then said Mr. Love-lust, I could never endure him. Nor I, said Mr. Live-loose, for he would always be condemning my way. Hang him, hang him, said Mr. Heady. A sorry scrub, said Mr. High-mind. My heart riseth against him, said Mr. Enmity. He is a rogue, said Mr. Liar. Hanging is too good for him, said Mr. Cruelty. Let us dispatch him out of the way, said Mr. Hate-light. Then said Mr. Implacable, Might I have all the world given me, I could not be reconciled to him; therefore let us forthwith bring him in guilty of death.

Very rarely, if ever, does Bunyan give to us a name which is not absolutely appropriate. In this facility Bunyan is rivalled only, though from a very different cause, by Dickens himself with his Sam Weller, Mr. Pickwick, Mr. Micawber, and Mr. Mantalini, whose names seem to be in themselves the epitome of their characters.

Then there are the vignette sketches in which in a few sentences we have the deeper character brought before us of people whom we meet every day of our lives. Here, for instance, is the photograph of Mr. Ready-to-halt, and of the great change wrought in him at the last crisis of all:

When he came to the brink of the river he said, Now I shall have no more need of these crutches, since yonder are chariots and horses for me to ride on. The last words he was heard to say were, Welcome Life! So he went his way.

Or Mr. Despondency, whose daughter was Miss Much Afraid:

When the days had many of them passed away, Mr. Despondency was sent for; for a post was come, and brought this message to him: Trembling man! these are to summon thee to be ready with the King by the next Lord's day, to shout for joy for thy deliverance from all thy doubtings. When the time was come for them to depart, they went up to the brink of the river. The last words of Mr. Despondency were Farewell night; welcome day! His daughter went through the river singing, but no one could understand what she said.

Then there is the immortal last scene in the life of Mr. Valiant-for-truth:

Then, said he, I am going to my Father's; and though with great difficulty I have got hither, yet now I do not repent me of all the troubles I have been at to arrive where I am. My sword I give to him that shall succeed me in my pilgrimage, and my courage and skill to him that can get it. My marks and scars I carry with me to be a witness for me that I have fought His battles who now will be my rewarder. When the day that he must go hence was come, many accompanied him to the river-side,

into which as he went he said, "Death, where is thy sting?" And as he went down deeper, he said, "Grave, where is thy victory?" So he passed over, and all the trumpets sounded for him on the other side.

But we must forbear. On every page of this wonderful work, save indeed in the few pages where he loses himself in Puritan theology, there are character descriptions that are the priceless possession of English literature for ever.

How easily it all came. Let anyone read the Author's Apology:

Thus I set pen to paper with delight,
And quickly had my thoughts in black and white.
For having now my method by the end,
Still as I pull'd, it came; and so I penn'd
It down; until at last it came to be,
For length and breadth, the bigness which you see.

Some of us know what it is still "to pull" with our pens and, alas, the true thought or the right word never comes. But here is a work which comes because it is just the expression of the man. There are, of course, defects in the *Pilgrim's Progress*, as indeed there are spots on the sun. As a child I remember I liked the second part better than the first. There was a sort of feeling of a conducted tour about it as well as of family life, and I remember how my brother and myself only wished that in some way or other we could be like Greatheart, helping others to bliss. And yet, viewed critically, the second part of the *Pilgrim's Progress*, like most second parts, is poor compared with the first. There are, of course, as with Bunyan there could not fail to be, wonderful passages in it. It is in the second part that we have that fine hymn which has only recently come into its own:

Who would true valour see,
Let him come hither;
One here will constant be,
Come wind, come weather;
There's no discouragement
Shall make him once relent
His first avowed intent
To be a pilgrim.

Whoso beset him round
With dismal stories,
Do but themselves confound;
His strength the more is.
No lion can him fright,
He'll with a giant fight,
But he will have a right
To be a pilgrim.

Hobgoblin nor foul fiend
 Can daunt his spirit;
 He knows he at the end
 Shall life inherit.
 Then fancies fly away;
 He'll not fear what men say;
 He'll labour night and day
 To be a pilgrim.

And it is in the second part that we have those immortal vignettes, some of which we have quoted, of the pilgrims who have come to the border of the river. Nevertheless, the second part is fundamentally contradictory in its theology to the first part. There is even a bit of love-making thrown in, though we are bound to confess that the way in which Matthew and Mercy were married off would scarcely meet with the approval of a more sentimental generation:

And, Christiana, said this inn-keeper, I am glad to see thee and thy friend Mercy together here, a lovely couple. And if I may advise, take Mercy into a nearer relation to thee: if she will, let her be given to Matthew, thy eldest son. It is the way to preserve a posterity in the earth. So this match was concluded, and in process of time they were married.

There is this much to be said for the second part that, compared with the second part of *Robinson Crusoe*, it is infinitely finer. As for the third part of *Robinson Crusoe*, it should long ago have been cut off from the first part and bound up separately for the benefit of students only. The truth is that the second part is too accommodating altogether, and the main essential facts of the spiritual progress are often lost sight of. Nothing, for instance, is more true to experience than the burden which Christian had to carry until lost at the foot of the Cross. But a household each one down to the tiniest tot carrying their burden, and Mr. Greatheart standing by with no burden of his own to carry, would have been absurd as well as ungallant. Nor could Greatheart have offered to have carried their burdens for them unless indeed he had become so identified with the Lord Jesus as to alter the whole basis of the pilgrimage, and the whole concept of his character. Who Greatheart is Bunyan never worked out. We wish we could think that here Bunyan gives us his portrait of the ideal minister who spends his life helping others on their road to Zion.

There are many other remarks that we might well add, but in the short space left at our disposal we propose to concentrate upon the theology of the work. In the *Pilgrim's Progress* individualism reaches its high-water mark of spiritual values. In this respect it is characteristic of the fierce individualism

which was the essence of Puritanism, especially of the Independents, and the basis of the Reformation. To this individualism in the first part there is no exception; both Faithful and Hopeful are brought in only as companions to Christian because of literary needs. A man travelling altogether by himself, unable ever to speak the deepest thoughts of his heart, and yet who shall interest his readers, was beyond even the genius of a Bunyan to construct. It is characteristic of this individualism that the Church plays almost no part in Bunyan's allegory. It is true that there is one place in which it appears, the House Beautiful. And truly no more wonderful description has ever been given than that which we have here of all that the Church or the House of God—Bunyan would not have distinguished between them—can be to the pilgrim. We must not press too far the contention that the Church only comes into the pilgrim's life at one point. It is difficult to see how on a journey it could come in otherwise, for the Church is static and could not go through the pilgrim's experiences. To make the Church a superior comrade, a sort of Greatheart, would have destroyed the whole basis of the Progress. It is fair also to point out that in the House Beautiful there is solely instruction, in itself a characteristic Nonconformist attitude. Neither there nor anywhere else on the journey have the sacraments as such any real place or any help to give.

The individualistic basis of the *Pilgrim's Progress* is well brought out if at the risk of some repetition we compare it with the greatest of all mediæval poems—Dante's *Divine Comedy*—in which more than in any other work we find the genius of the Roman Church. In the Roman Church the individual *qua* individual had little or no place. His salvation was conditioned from first to last by his belonging to a corporation, in whose privileges and functions he shared; through whose sacraments his life was nourished; by whose graduated hierarchy, though but the meanest servant of the Church, he was linked on to the Supreme Head; whose saints, their human sympathies deepened by their glory, shielded him by their merits and intercessions. Through this corporation alone was he brought into touch with his Saviour; outside the corporation his soul was lost. Men were saved both in this world and in the world to come by their fitting in with the whole. Thus salvation with Dante is achieved by a scheme which brings within its compass universal man, and which takes him for its accomplishment through all the circles of earth, heaven, and hell. With Dante the sins whereby men are damned are as a rule sins against the corporation. Christian, on the other hand, is the lonely traveller, who begins his religious life with fleeing from his home because of his individual anguish, and whose companion is soon torn from him.

From first to last sin is an individual fact. Only once in a long pilgrimage, as we have already seen in the House Beautiful, has the Church anything to give to his spiritual needs. Alone he traverses the dark valley, with no sacraments of the Church to drive away his terrors. In Dante the corporate whole is supreme; with Bunyan the individual.

The individualistic basis of the *Pilgrim's Progress* was characteristic of Puritanism. Puritanism stood for the emphasis on individuality; it placed the individual absolutely face to face with God; there was nothing between, neither priest nor Church, nor even a Saviour. In this we see the secret of the rugged, dour manhood which it has produced in Scotland and South Africa. But by a familiar spiritual paradox this very strength of individuality arose from the overwhelming consciousness of the believer that he was absolutely nothing before God, in whose service alone he would find the end of his existence. God and His Will were all in all; the individual was but the channel for His motions. Whether in heaven or in hell the meanest being existed merely for the pleasure of the Eternal, his every action limited and conditioned before all time by sovereign decree. "He had been wrested," as Macaulay tells us in a famous passage, "by no common deliverer from the grasp of no common foe. It was for him that the sun had been darkened, that the rocks had been rent, that the dead had risen, that all nature had shuddered." All is viewed, as Spinoza—the representative in philosophy of this same creed—would phrase it, *sub specie eternitatis*, and forms part of an eternal scheme of which in one sense the individual is the centre and cause—this last, paradoxically, no mean exaltation for the individual otherwise reduced to the consciousness that he is a mere "worm." But if we are to understand the century that followed Bunyan we must remember that with Calvinism the note of the Supreme Being is neither reason, nor love, but omnipotence, depicted by its writers in a way that seems to the modern mind almost a-moral. Man is viewed as but the potter's clay, sonship something that may or may not be added at whim.

The *Pilgrim's Progress* is also remarkable for the contempt that Bunyan expresses for the power of Rome. In a memorable scene he pictures Giant Pope in his cave at the end of the Valley of the Shadow of Death, and tells us that

though he be yet alive, he is, by reason of age, and also of the many shrewd brushes that he met with in his younger days, grown so crazy and stiff in his joints, that he can now do little more than sit in his cave's mouth, grinning at pilgrims as they go by, and biting his nails because he cannot come at them.

And this was written only a few years before the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and within a few years of Milton's sonnet on the slaughtered Waldensians. In the second part of *Pilgrim's Progress* Giant Pope disappears altogether. His place is taken by Giant Maul, "who did haste to spoil young pilgrims with sophistry." Was this elimination of the Pope part of the price that Nonconformity was asked to pay for the toleration of James II. ? Or was it a prevision of the havoc that Deism was about to accomplish in Nonconformist circles, when Calvinism without enthusiasm worked itself out to its logical end, and salvation ceased to be in any way the act of the individual and became the result of immutable decree ?

Bunyan's theology in its main outline is strictly Augustinian. But we may be thankful that in *The Holy War* Augustine's doctrine of total depravity is thrown overboard, probably quite unconsciously. Even when the Diabolonians capture the city there are still left in Mansoul many of Emanuel's adherents. In one thing *The Holy War* is characteristic of the Puritan outlook. As in Milton's *Paradise Lost*, Mansoul is the centre of the universe, in whose fall or redemption the hosts of Heaven are supremely interested. In the current astronomy sun, moon, and stars still revolved round the earth.

There is one matter not often noticed in which Bunyan's theological influence has been supreme. We refer to his effect on current eschatology. What the Catholic Church holds as regards the intermediate state we do not here propose to discuss, if only because it is needless. We do not forget that in a very memorable instance, which Rome has taken care to suppress, one of the popes, John XXII., indulged in heresies on this matter by his doctrine of the retardation of the beatific vision. These heresies he retracted on his deathbed; at any rate, this is the accepted story in Roman circles, all duly set out in a unique manuscript in the Cambridge University library. Be this as it may, and be the Catholic doctrine what it may, the retardation of the beatific vision has no place whatever in Bunyan's great work, but altogether the opposite. The pilgrims pass direct over the river into heaven itself. A collective judgment day disappears. For the victorious Christian earth merges at once in heaven; it is all direct, continuous, immediate. We believe that the current theology of the vast mass of the people in this respect has been more moulded for good or ill by Bunyan's great work than by all the eschatological treatises ever written. In the Middle Ages the judgment day, as depicted on the walls of the church, was a living factor in the thought of the people. Except as theory, through the influence of Bunyan, it has little place today, save as an individual judgment on each life as completed.

H. B. WORKMAN.

THE "PILGRIM'S PROGRESS" AND ITS ROAD

It is customary to describe John Bunyan, as there are still some who will describe John Milton, as typical, though outstanding, products of English Puritanism. It would be more accurate surely to say of both these exceedingly dissimilar men that they were *sui generis*, and only by the accidents of their birth, their upbringing, and the age into which they were born, associated with Puritanism at all. Milton, with all his magnificent poetic endowment, was a fiercely independent controversialist to whom controversy was—or at least became—the breath of life; as ready to fall foul of his own side as of his natural adversaries, and having only in common with Puritanism a complete disregard of the law of love as the foundation of Christianity. Bunyan, on the other hand, stands out among Puritans far less as a controversialist than as a mystic, saturated with the law of love, which he had learned from that Vision of the crucified Saviour, so strangely overlooked by most readers of the *Pilgrim's Progress*. He was a humorist, an amused and kindly student of humanity as well as a very shrewd one, ready to smile at its weaknesses while appreciating its good points; and one who, while paying conscientious lip-service to Puritan theology, left it far behind and below him in his passionate devotion to the Lord Jesus. He could be stern on occasion, but his sternness was reserved for moral rather than intellectual obliquity. One cannot imagine him as a persecutor, and such persecution as he underwent he describes almost dispassionately and without any yearning for retaliation. But to all things bright and beautiful, whether it were a fine character or a fair landscape, the song of birds in springtime or the Vision Splendid which never left him, he was acutely sensitive, and therein lies much of the compelling charm of his great work. Milton, speaking in the person of Satan, proclaimed that it was "better to reign in hell than serve in heaven," and, in that last terrible prayer of Samson for one moment of his ancient strength to overwhelm his enemies in swift destruction, vented the fierce disappointment and desire for vengeance of his declining years. Bunyan's old age, as expressed in the Second Part of his book, was full of mellow kindliness born of garnered spiritual experience and the balanced wisdom of life, revealing itself in the person of Mr. Greatheart, perhaps the noblest of the characters that throng his stage. Milton died a soured and embittered man; Bunyan's end was peace. But in sheer genius and indepen-

dence of outlook both Milton and Bunyan far outsoared the shadow of the night of Puritanism.

We have said that Bunyan was more merciful to intellectual than to moral obliquity; but it should be added that to the intellectual obliquity which we call humbug he was merciless. The "stupidity against which the gods themselves fight in vain" was to him anathema. No writer—not Thackeray himself—has produced a more realistic gallery of snobs and humbugs than might be collected from his writings. In this particular Mr. Kipling's eulogy is not excessive:

Likewise the Lords of Looseness
That hamper faith and works,
The Perseverance-Doubters,
The Present-Comfort shirks,
With brittle intellectuals
Who crack beneath a strain—
John Bunyan met that helpful set
In Charles the Second's reign.

Ignorance might win to the very threshold of the Celestial City, but it availed him nothing. As Christian said whisperingly, "There is more hopes of a Fool than of him." He was a humbug of the most pestilential type, one who hampered progress and ignored the knowledge that might have saved him and his fellows; a short and sharp way bore him into hell when the prize seemed actually within his grasp. For simple humanity that is the eternal prey of humbugs Bunyan had nothing but pity, and his handling of them, in the true spirit of his Master, is full of gentleness and sympathy, born of a just vision of their difficulties and limitations and fiery indignation at their wrongs. Who does not recall the half-humorous, half-irritable outburst at the mention of Mr. Fearing?

He was a man that had the Root of the Matter in him, but he was one of the most troublesome Pilgrims that ever I met in all my days. . . . I never had a doubt about him that he was a man of choice Spirit, only he was always kept very low, and that made his Life so burthensome to himself, and so troublesome to others.

And with Mr. Fearing are gathered his spiritual kinsfolk, Mr. Ready-to-halt upon his crutches, Mr. Feeble-mind and Mr. Despondency and his daughter Miss Much-afraid, newly released from the dungeons of Giant Despair and Doubting Castle. Something must have moved Bunyan when he wrote this. These are the heavy-laden folk, the flotsam and jetsam of the world, who never, to all appearance, get a fair chance in the rough-and-tumble of life, and Bunyan is one of the earliest writers to give expression to the obligation in respect of them

which rests upon all followers of the Lord Jesus. And all this is part of his wonderful realism.

Bunyan, we have said, was a mystic as well as a realist, in that to him the unseen world was infinitely more real and more abiding than that which we call the "seen." He was a follower of the Vision, if ever there was one; he was a mystic of the concrete, inasmuch as he thought in terms of terrestrial reality and drew his imagery and inspiration from what the world calls concrete sources. From his description of the Rood which Christian saw at the outset of his pilgrimage and the effect it had upon him, we may safely conjecture that some similar experience had marked a turning-point in his own life. He would have concurred with Goethe's Time-Spirit:

'Tis thus at the roaring loom of Time I ply,
And weave for God the Garment thou seest Him by.

This it is which lends to his allegory such vivid actuality. There must have been many contemporaries who recognized the locality from which he drew his inspiration—the country of the Pilgrimage, the religious fairs, the "iron mylles" which he describes so exactly under the veil of the Valley of the Shadow of Death, the newly-opened chalk-pits along the Pilgrim's Way that figure as the Silver-mines, and vivid touches in his story enlarged and amplified in not a few cases when he comes to tell the story of Christiana—the product of preaching-tours among the Surrey hills and—

—happy summer days gone by,
And vanished summer glory.

The present writer can himself recall, when as a boy with other boys he was wandering fifty years since on the slopes of Cold-harbour and Leith Hill, being told by a hospitable woman at a farmhouse that these were the Delectable Mountains, showing that a tradition to this effect still lingered in that exquisite neighbourhood. This combination of realism and mysticism is unusual, and gives to the *Pilgrim's Progress* that air of startling actuality which is, perhaps, the outstanding secret of its success. For once the man in the street, the frivolous woman of fashion, the society trifter, and indeed all sorts and conditions of men and women could be inveigled into seeing themselves and their surroundings, as it were, *sub specie æternitatis*, with a fair prospect of being roused thereby into seriousness. Something of the same effect is produced by William Law's *Serious Call* with its splendid gallery of living types of men and women; but his book is rather for the few than for the many, and certainly not for the man in the street.

The message of the *Pilgrim's Progress*, on the contrary, is for all mankind.

Comparatively recent investigation has shown that the *Pilgrim's Progress* must have been written during a six months' close imprisonment in the Gatehouse on Bedford Bridge in 1675-6, the actual warrant for which was brought to light in 1887. In Bunyan's previous imprisonment in the County Gaol, from 1660 to 1672 the conditions were so far relaxed as to permit him liberty even to "go to see Christians in London"; his friends had free access to him; and he was allowed at times to preach to his fellow-prisoners. Towards the end, it would seem, he was allowed to spend his time outside the gaol on condition that he did not leave Bedford. But there is no reason to suppose that such latitude was allowed during the imprisonment in the Gatehouse. In such conditions he was able to devote himself undisturbed to literary work. He had got something on order which he had almost completed; he was writing, he says, "of the Way," and then slipped off into an allegory which developed into the *Pilgrim's Progress*. So, it would seem, it was "the Way" which suggested the Pilgrim's Way and the Pilgrimage and the immortal allegory.

Thus was the masterpiece born—a lonely prisoner immured in a comfortless Gatehouse built over a dark river, diverging from some less congenial task to put to paper certain strange fancies that suddenly crowded upon him, "before I was aware," as he says; memories of journeys on ministerial duty that insistently shaped themselves into episodes and developed into a connected whole as his pen travelled swiftly along. Then came the question of printing and publication of what had grown into a finished work. At first he seems to have had doubts about printing it at all, and with good reason. The idea of a pilgrimage and pilgrims must to Puritans have savoured dangerously of Rome; the more so as in his native county such dreadful things were known by hearsay only. Then, as we shall see, a Cross and afterwards a Crucifix figured prominently in the story, an outrage that all good Protestants would resent. Yet the thing was obviously inspired and not to be lightly disregarded. He had, so far as he first realized the situation, written only to please himself.

—I did not think

To show to all the World my Pen and Ink

In such a mode; I only thought to make

I knew not what: nor did I undertake

Thereby to please my Neighbour; no, not I;

And did it mine own self to gratify. . . .

Thus I set Pen to Paper with delight,

And quickly had my thoughts in black and white.

His friends could not agree about it—

Some said, John, print it; others said, Not so:

Some said, It might do good; others said, No.

Bunyan was too genuine and fearless a mystic not soon to recognize his responsibility for such a trust. So the first edition of his book was registered at Stationers' Hall in December, 1677, the year after his release; notable additions were made in the second and third editions, which followed close upon its heels. The eighth edition, with his final touches, appeared in 1682, and two more editions in 1684 and 1685.

In England itself the book was welcomed by readers of all ages and rank. It holds something like the record for having been translated into eighty foreign tongues, and its appeal appears to be unlimited. Human nature and humanity in recognizable surroundings were what Bunyan really set out to portray, and humanity at large has taken him to its heart in consequence.

There is little doubt that in his choice of a setting for his allegory Bunyan was drawing from a patch of country of which it is at least certain that he had some knowledge. His preaching tours took him into many parts of England, and a well-founded tradition associates him with Guildford and the Williamson family, long resident there on Quarry Hill. The late General Renouard James was, we believe, the first investigator to suggest a serious study of the Pilgrims' Way, so-called, which runs through Guildford in its passage from west to east across England, and to associate it with the *Pilgrim's Progress*—this was as far back as 1871. The great Pilgrimage, which attached its name to what is more accurately termed the Old Road, the ancient neolithic highway that carried the traffic in tin from Cornwall to Thanet, originated in the murder of Archbishop Thomas Becket on December 29, 1170, and his subsequent canonization on February 21, 1173. The first pilgrim, King Henry II. himself, landing at Southampton in July of the following year, proceeded to Canterbury by the Old Road, thus blazing the trail for the innumerable train who followed the same route between that date and 1537, some 350 years, when the Pilgrimage was ruthlessly suppressed and the remains of the martyr-Archbishop scattered by King Henry VIII. The memories of the Pilgrimage, especially along the countryside, to which it brought money and prosperity, would die hard, and when Bunyan made acquaintance with Guildford, little more than a century later, those memories must have been comparatively fresh. Men would tell how money flowed into the towns and rest-houses along the Way,

when long cavalcades of pilgrims from overseas travelled along it in December and July to the feasts of the Martyrdom and the Translation of St. Thomas of Canterbury, as well as between whiles; when the churches and chapels along the route were thronged with worshippers and the fairs with visitors, and the countryside was not, as in Bunyan's day, all but deserted and silent save for occasional wayfarers and the clanging forges of the "iron mylles." Of these past glories little remained; the local sense of grievance must have been bitter, and legends of that golden age would lose nothing by repetition. The religious fairs alone survived, in more or less attenuated form, to bear witness to the ancient life and gaiety of the old pilgrim route—there were three annual fairs at Farnham alone, others are recorded as having been held at Wanborough, Puttenham, St. Catherine's Chapel, Shalford, Guildford (where four such fairs were held yearly), St. Martha's, and Dorking. Thus the framework and inspiration for Bunyan's allegory were ready to hand.

Moreover, assuming that the route which he took started from Guildford and Shalford Meadows, where the Old Road crosses the Wey under the shadow of St. Catherine's Chapel, and continues to follow the Pilgrim's Way to Betchworth Chalk Pit, thence diverging to Doubting (or Dowding) Castle—still marked upon the Ordnance Map—every feature which he portrays is to be found in its right place and order. From Doubting Castle he must have travelled through Reigate by Nutley Lane and Park Lane—probably a neolithic trackway converted by the Romans into a connection with the Stane Street at Holmwood or Ockley—to Leith Hill, which, with Friday Street, corresponds exactly with his Delectable Mountains. After this the topography seems to be imaginary, though the Dark River may be a reminiscence of the stream which flowed beneath his prison floor. Actually, one would suppose, from Leith Hill he would have completed his round by returning to his friends, the Williamsons, at Guildford. We will endeavour, in the remainder of our available space, to condense the evidence for this theory.

Efforts have been made to identify other localities with the scene of the *Pilgrim's Progress*, especially in Bedfordshire, but to our mind this cannot be satisfactorily done. There was, to begin with, no pilgrim route and tradition in Bedfordshire; and nothing, except perhaps some great house or two—as at Ampthill or Elstow—to draw as the House Beautiful, that could be associated with his allegory. There was nothing in Bedfordshire to correspond with the Valley of the Shadow of Death; whereas, as we shall show, it was exactly reproduced

upon the route which we have suggested. Nor can Bedfordshire produce a Doubting Castle, whereas upon the suggested route it may still be seen, in its right place and order, upon old maps as well as new. The present writer, who was largely brought up in Bedfordshire, where he can count some three generations of family connections, has a natural bias in favour of that county, which most reluctantly he finds himself unable to indulge. On the other hand, he has found that one has only to traverse the route here suggested to find corroborations great and small on every hand, vivid bits of description, local indications such as north and south, right and left, all along the Way—as Bunyan also calls it—which leave no doubt in his mind that along the Pilgrims' Way, on the portion indicated, he is treading in the footsteps of Christian and Greatheart and their creator, John Bunyan—"the tinker out of Bedford."

Upon this theory our pilgrim starts from the Slough of Despond (or Shalford Meadows), a swampy spot adjoining the City of Destruction, which last may or may not be a particular name for Guildford. This point need not be too closely pressed. The Meadows and the fruitless attempts to construct a causeway across them (from the ferry at St. Catherine's) for the use of travellers are vividly portrayed with sufficient clearness. He emerges on the highroad (between Guildford and Shalford), and crosses it to find a "wicket-gate" opening onto the Way. This gate is commanded by Beelzebub's (or Guildford) Castle, whence his sharpshooters were wont to annoy travellers. The wicket-gate is used in the technical sense of the smaller entrance through a double gateway, such as may still be seen in the remains of ancient monasteries; it is served by a porter; there is an inscription over the gateway; there was also (as noted in the Second Part) a trumpeter's gallery whence a fanfare was sounded to welcome honoured guests; and a roof-walk for a watchman or sentry, and a "summer parlour" below. This gate opened onto a monastic property, still called Chantries. Within the gateway was a Cross, on a rising ground, at the sight of which Christian was freed of his burden. Here again we have exactly the arrangement which can still be seen in existing monastic remains (Kenilworth and Worksop occur to us as we write), except that such crosses were always Calvaries or Roods with the Divine Figure upon them. A little later, however, when Christian tells the story to the ladies of the House Beautiful, he explicitly mentions that it was a Rood, and that in terms which clearly indicate a vivid personal experience, and even a turning-point in the life of the author, quite extraordinary in one who called himself a Puritan; only

to be accounted for by the fact that Bunyan was before everything a genuine mystic and truth-teller.

Let us pause to hear his account of it; the passage is worth quoting:

PIETY. And what saw you else in the way?

CHRISTIAN. Why I went but a little further, and I saw one, as I thought in my mind, hang bleeding upon the Tree; and the very sight of him made my burden fall off my back. . . . 'Twas a strange thing to me, for I never saw such a thing before. . . .

PRUDENCE. Can you remember by what means you find your annoyances at times as if they were vanquished?

CHRISTIAN. Yes, when I think what I saw at the Cross, that will do it . . . and when my thoughts wax warm about whither I am going, that will do it.

PRUDENCE. And what is it that makes you so desirous to go to Mount Zion?

CHRISTIAN. Why there I hope to see him alive, that did hang dead on the Cross; and there . . . they say there is no death, and there I shall dwell with such Company as I like best. For to tell you the truth, I love him because I was by him eased of my burden, and I am weary of my inward sickness; I would fain be where I shall die no more, and with the Company that shall continually cry Holy, Holy, Holy.

This Rood, we may note, is reproduced in Mr. Comper's Bunyan window in Westminster Abbey.

Returning to the pilgrimage, we next find Christian struggling up the Hill Difficulty; this corresponds closely (as General James points out) with St. Martha's Hill. It will be recalled that on the way Christian was accosted by Formalist and Hypocrisie, who essayed to get round the base of the Hill on either side instead of going up it by the narrow path, and were miserably cast away. Here we get corroboration from an unexpected quarter—to wit, Mr. Hilaire Belloc—who, writing of this very Hill, though with no reference to Bunyan, pictures the mediæval pilgrim being instructed in such terms as these:

You must, of ritual, climb that isolated hill which you see against the sky. The spirits haunted it and were banished by the faith, and they say that martyrs died there. . . . From step to step the pilgrims were compelled to take the oldest of paths. The same force of antique usage and affection which, in a past beyond all record, had lent their meaning to rocks and springs upon a public way, reflowered. . . . Our remote ancestry was baptized again, and that good habit of the faith, whereby it refuses to break with any chain of human development, marked and retained for history the oldest things.

Herein, then, lay the sin of Formalist and Hypocrisie, that they disregarded the evident tradition of the Hill.

Tytings Farm still marks the position and perhaps retains some of the original structure of a rest-house for pilgrims on

the Hill. As to the identity of the House Beautiful, it may be noted that there is no need to fall back on Bedfordshire for its prototype. The whole of this neighbourhood was studded with noble mansions built by wealthy iron-masters and wool-merchants, many of which are still standing and famous; one of them, that belonging to the Evelyns at Wotton, only a few miles distant, contains, and did then contain, just such a collection of "Rarities" as might have suggested that of the House Beautiful, which includes locks of hair from the head and beard of King Charles I. and the Prayer Book which he used on the scaffold. It has been suggested, and it is quite probable, that the ladies at Little Gidding, whom Bunyan might well have encountered when wandering about the country with his father as a boy, were the originals of those at the House Beautiful, whom they certainly resembled in many particulars; but that does not affect our present argument. More noteworthy is it that he was shown a distant view of the Delectable Mountains to the South, which is exactly where it should be, and the lovely view of Immanuel's Land is vividly expressed in Bunyan's description:

—a most pleasant Mountainous Countrey, beautified with Woods, Vinyards, Fruits of all sorts, Flowers also; Springs and Fountains, very delectable to behold.

Another coincidence is worth noting. To ascend the Hill on the western side, as Christian did, is nothing like so arduous as the descent on the eastern slope, where the gradient is much steeper, and the loose, gravelly soil offers a precarious foothold. So, evidently, it was then. "Then said Christian, As it was difficult coming up, so (so far as I can see) it is dangerous going down." Christiana's experience was very similar: "It was a steep Hill and the way was slippery; but they were very careful, so they got down pretty well." On which Mr. Great-heart observed later: "'Tis easier going up than down this Hill; and that can be said but of few Hills in all these parts of the World." A more recent traveller, Mr. Elliston-Erwood, speaking of this same descent, observes: "Our descent is a rush down a sandy gully, the steepness of which is daily aggravated by the continuous wearing away of the sand."

The Valley of Humiliation (or Humility), which lay at the base of the Hill, led Christian towards the Valley of the Shadow of Death, near the entrance of which he met and encountered Apollyon. An adjacent lane, locally called "Bloody Hedges," may mark the scene of the combat. The description of this Valley, the valley of the Tillingbourne stretching from Chilworth to Abinger and Wotton, marked to this day by its chain of

"hammer-ponds," corresponds in detail with the contemporary description of the iron workings—"iron-mylles" they are called in old deeds—which had for many centuries made of that region a veritable Black Country, and continued to do so for something like a century longer. It seems no impossible guess to suppose that an encounter with some grimy ruffian supplied the idea for Christian's combat with Apollyon. The whole smelting process may be reconstructed from a rare seventeenth-century work by John Ray, *A Collection of English Words not generally Used*, which may be supplemented from catalogues of mining and smelting tools to be found in contemporary legal documents. Hydraulic power to work the unwieldy hammers which shaped the metal was obtained by damming up the stream to form what are still known as "hammer-ponds"; the process of smelting was kept going for long periods on end, day and night, to the accompaniment of the clang of falling hammers, the hissing of water from hydraulic pipes, spurts of flame and smoke, the roar of blast-furnaces, the shouts and strainings of the rough toilers engaged; while the condition of the roads, from which they were wont to dig the iron ore whenever convenient, was the cause of frequent complaint—from Daniel Defoe among others. Bunyan speaks of "Pits and Pitfalls, deep Holes and Shelvings." No wonder that wayfarers found it "every whit dreadful, being utterly without order"; and that to Christian it seemed to be "the mouth of hell," and that he was "so confounded that he did not know his own voice." Christiana's experience later on supplies yet further and not less convincing details. The whole description is a vivid, and, we believe, the only contemporary picture of the vanished industry which once made of this fair region a Black Country of the most detestable kind. It is to be noted that when Christian returned by way of the Delectable Mountains he was shown another "mouth of hell" near the summit of "Mount Clear"; doubtless this was Friday Street, on the upper slopes of Leith Hill, now one of the most exquisite spots in England, but then merely the highest of the hammer-ponds near the head waters of the Tillingbourne, with its forge and flame and clanging tumult, and accessories of grime and smoke and filth. This point is in reality little over a mile from the Valley of the Shadow itself.

The picture of Vanity Fair is probably that of a typical religious fair in those parts; the particular locality would seem to be Dorking, though there were plenty of others to choose from, as we have seen. But it connects with the old Pilgrimage in the statement: "The Ware of Rome and her Merchandize is greatly promoted in this Fair: only our English Nation, with

some others, have taken a dislike thereat." And the trial of Faithful and Christian reproduces correctly the court of summary jurisdiction that controlled such gatherings, that of Pie Powder (*pieds pouldreux*—i.e., "dusty-feet"). And the jury that heard the case—well, only Bunyan could describe that jury!

The next point of contact is "the little Hill called Lucre"—and the Silver-mine. Here we may call in Mr. Belloc once again, for in the guise of the silver-mines Bunyan was denouncing the greed and callousness of those who mutilated the Way for their own profit, to the great danger and hurt of the King's lieges, by using it as a base for the great chalk-pits which are still a characteristic feature of the North Downs. This particular one strongly suggests Betchworth, where Christian lost his way and strayed across Walton Heath to Doubting Castle. Let us hear Mr. Belloc:

The Old Road, being originally the only track along these hills, was necessarily the base of every pit that should be dug. Along it alone could the chalk be carried or the lime when it was baked, and it was necessary for the Britons, the Romans, and their successors to make the floor of the mine just upon a level with this track. Later, when the valley roads developed and the Old Road was no longer continuously used, it was profitable to sink the cutting further, below the level of the Old Road, and indeed as far as the chalk comes to mix with the sand or clay of the lower level. As the Old Road grew more and more neglected, the duty of protecting it was forgotten and the exploitation of the pits at last destroyed it at these points.

This is exactly what Bunyan complained of:

Now at the further side of the plain was a little hill called Lucre, and in that hill a silver-mine, which some of them that had formerly gone that way, because of the rarity of it, had turned aside to see; but going too near the brink of the pit, the ground being deceitful under them, broke, and they were slain; some also had been maimed there, and could not to their dying day be their own men again.

This is the one occasion when Bunyan seems to depart from the strict order of succession, in that he interposes the River of God and the pleasant Meadow adjoining it. But immediately after come a series of references to the Way, which the pilgrims durst not leave, and then follows By-path Meadow and the stile leading thereto on the left-hand side—which on our theory would be correct—and the pathway that landed the pilgrims in the pit by Doubting Castle; the pit may be identified with one of the gravel "pockets" on Walton Heath in which, *experto crede*, it is perfectly possible to be unpleasantly bogged in wet weather. Doubting Castle still exists, a rectangular earthwork, probably of Roman origin, called, as earthworks are in many places, notably on the Berkshire Downs, a "castle."

Upon that highly suggestive name Bunyan builds up the episode of Giant Despair and his victims.

After this point we hear no more of the Way, for Christian—or Bunyan—descended into Reigate by the old turnpike road, and travelling along the Romanized track now marked by Nutley Lane and Park Lane, arrived at Holmwood, where the climb up to Coldharbour and Leith Hill (the Delectable Mountains) begins. Reigate formed the turning-point of his tour, being the head of a hairpin bend, already referred to, which took him straight back towards Guildford. The Shepherds received Christian hospitably, and after showing him "the Gate of Hell," as we have already seen, took him to the summit of the hill (Mount Clear) and showed him the wonderful view of the adjoining peaks, Mount Marvel, Mount Caution, Mount Error, Mount Charity and the rest, and the wonderful panorama beyond. Then came the crowning vision, the like of which some of us also have seen from the same spot, of Shoreham Gap and the town and sea beyond.

Let us shew to the Pilgrims the Gates of the Coelestial City, if they have skill to look through our Perspective Glass. The Pilgrims then lovingly accepted the motion: so they had them to the top of an high Hill, called *Clear*, and gave them their Glass to look. Then they essayed to look, but the remembrance of that last thing that the Shepherds had shewed them made their hand shake, by means of which impediment they could not look steadily through the Glass; yet they thought they saw something like the Gate, and also some of the Glory of the place.

There we must leave him. In the Second Part there is much to supplement the First and to strengthen the views that we have endeavoured to express. In it, too, there is something of the note of old age, which sees the younger generations shooting up and bringing others into the world ere one has realized that they are not still the children of our memories and dreams; even so do its characters race in its pages from babyhood to youth and youth to manhood. But for those of us who know the country of the Pilgrimage the ancient Way beneath its spreading yews along the green hillsides will always call up visions of the wayfarers that live in Bunyan's "unvalued book":

Who chase through dim and devious ways
The Vision that forever flies,
And still-receding Alps that raise
Clear summits into cloudless skies;
Till the day break and shadows flee,
And the faint East in glory fires;
And lo, beyond the lambent sea
The golden gates and glittering spires!

H. P. KENNEDY SKIPTON.

BOSSUET, LEIBNITZ, AND REUNION*

The subject allotted to me is so wide that even if I had the requisite knowledge, I must despair of dealing with it in any adequate or helpful fashion in a single, brief paper. I have therefore taken the somewhat drastic step of reducing its terms from the plural to the singular. I propose to tell the story of a single attempt to heal that one breach of unity which most closely concerns ourselves, since in it we are directly involved—the sixteenth-century disruption of Western Christendom. The attempt, however, of which I am to speak, is peculiarly significant and instructive for our purpose. For it was made under conditions the most favourable for effecting its object which have existed since the Church of the West was divided, it was continued over more than a quarter of a century, and it enlisted in its service two of the most notable European figures of the time, Leibnitz and Bossuet.

The last quarter of the seventeenth century was, as I have said, peculiarly favourable for an attempt of this kind. So far, at least, as the European Continent was concerned, the ecclesiastical results of the sixteenth-century schism were even from the first fairly definite and manageable, and with the passing of time became more and more so. The fissiparous tendency of the Reform which obstinately manifested itself in England and found its unhampered opportunity in the American Colonies had on the Continent been speedily arrested. There the post-Tridentine Roman Church, as the inheritor of traditional order and dogma, was confronted only by the Evangelical or Lutheran and the Reformed or Calvinist Communions. Moreover, the two great Churches of the Reform had developed their theology on the scholastic model, so that the Scholasticism of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, which had almost perished beneath the contempt of the Renaissance and had been also something of an offence to the first Reformers, renewed, and indeed intensified, its old intellectual rigour not only through the great Spanish theologians of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, but through the Evangelical and Reformed theologians as well. And though religious warfare may be the more deadly when waged with the same intellectual weapons and with the same trained skill in their use, yet it is likely also that when a truce is called the combatants will for this very reason have gained a greater understanding of and respect for one another. And by the middle of the seventeenth century a truce had, in fact, been

* A paper read at the meeting of the Anglican Fellowship in July, 1928.

called. Europe, bleeding almost to death from the wounds of the Thirty Years' War, lay exhausted as it lies today. And as today its physical exhaustion was accompanied by the spiritual exhaustion which wants peace at any price. The religious truce had been proclaimed and guaranteed politically by the Peace of Westphalia. But religion had learned something from that long and terrible struggle which no political guarantees could satisfy. The prolonged liberation of evil forces had overawed, some might say, perhaps, cowed, its spirit. It shuddered to remember that it itself in its quest for truth had released those forces. Was not the unity which had been violated in the name of truth perhaps after all the higher truth?

The Evangelical Church had, of course, as the Church of most German countries, suffered most. It was therefore in it that this new spirit emerged most definitely. The University of Helmstädt, where what may well be called the Calixtine dynasty reigned throughout three generations, became its centre. It was the declared aim of the Helmstädt theologians to restore communion with the Roman Church on the one hand and the Calvinist churches on the other. It was, however, principally towards Rome that their attention was directed, as it was with Rome that their real religious sympathy lay. Their plan of campaign was one which is not unfamiliar even today. They considered a fusion of the three great Communions impracticable, but thought that it was not impossible to procure a mutual toleration between them on the basis of their common acceptance of fundamentals—viz., the Creeds, the received opinions of the Fathers of the first five centuries to be regarded as equally true and binding as if textually contained in the Holy Scriptures, and belief in the mysteries without insistence on definitions as to the method of the Divine operation through them. The reconciling temper of the Helmstädt theology and the rapid dissemination of its influence throughout the Lutheran Churches of Germany and Scandinavia attracted, naturally enough, the attention of Rome; and an immediate consequence was the despatch by the Papal Court to the chief Lutheran centres of a number of Vicars-Apostolic commissioned to confer with the Lutheran divines and report to the Curia upon the prospects of ecclesiastical reunion. During the last forty years of the century we find such agents at Buda-Pesth, Dresden, Hanover, and Copenhagen. Of these the ablest and most prominent were Nicholas Stenon, a converted Danish Lutheran, and Christopher de Rojas de Spinola, Bishop of Tina in Bosnia, and afterwards of Neustadt in Austria.

During the latter half of the seventeenth century the house

of Lüneburg-Brunswick was the most prominent representative of Lutheranism in Germany, and Hanover as the principal capital of one of the branches of that house was therefore the chief centre of Lutheran influence. In 1665 John Frederick succeeded his brother on the ducal throne of Hanover. Fourteen years before he had been converted to the Roman Church through the instrumentality of a former Lutheran and pupil of Calixtus of Helmstädt. John Frederick was therefore a natural ally of the Helmstädt theologians, and two appointments which he made during his reign of thirteen years were of cardinal importance for the project of reunion which we are considering. In 1676 he called Leibnitz, then in his thirtieth year, to the court of Hanover as his secretary and historiographer. In the following year he appointed Molanus, the Lutheran Abbot of Loccum, superintendent of the Lutheran churches of the Lüneburg-Brunswick dominions. Leibnitz was an orthodox Lutheran who had up till the time of his coming to Hanover lived the life of a cosmopolitan scholar, first at Mainz in the service of von Boineburg, Chancellor to its Archbishop, and afterwards at Paris. The friendships, therefore, which he had formed were principally among Roman Catholics, and he had through them acquired a close and accurate knowledge of all the contemporary currents of feeling and opinion in the Roman Church. Molanus was a disciple of Calixtus, and shared to the full his master's reconciling attitude and temper.

In the year 1677, two years before John Frederick's death, Spinola succeeded Stenon, who had gone on to Copenhagen, in the special mission to Hanover, and between him and Molanus the negotiations for the reunion of the Churches were henceforth conducted. Molanus drew up a set of rules which were to govern the ecclesiastical reunion of all Christians. These rules—they form the document known as the "*Regulæ*" in the history of the project—seem to have completely satisfied Spinola and other Catholic theologians, who were regularly consulted in the framing of them. The fact is attested by Leibnitz, and is not in itself improbable, considering that at a later stage Bossuet's modifications of them bore upon one point only—though as we shall see that point was gravely important for the success or failure of the negotiations. Before, however, considering these rules and the discussions and explanations to which they gave rise, I must complete the account of the circumstances which attended the further history of the project. John Frederick died in 1679 and was succeeded by his brother Ernest Augustus, whose wife was the famous Electress Sophia, familiar to us as the granddaughter of our first Stuart King and the mother of our first Hanoverian one. Though brought up as

a Calvinist and steadfastly adhering in a Lutheran court to her own Calvinist worship, she was a woman of large intelligence and wide sympathies in matters of religion, and she speedily adopted Leibnitz as her literary and philosophic mentor. She was thus pledged from the beginning to a close interest in the Reunion project, and it was she indeed who first drew Bossuet into the negotiations which his name has made so famous. Sophia's younger sister Louisa had many years before joined the Roman Church, and was now Abbess of Maubuisson, near Pontoise. One of the members of that community, Mme. Brinon, was a friend and penitent of Bossuet. Through her the Electress communicated a copy of Molanus' "*Regulæ*" to Bossuet with a request for his judgment upon it. Bossuet seems to have regarded the matter as of little consequence, and it was not till some years afterwards that he was induced by Pellisson, a famous Doctor of the Sorbonne and a converted Huguenot, to take it seriously. In the interval the Electress and Mme. Brinon and Pellisson and Leibnitz had been conducting an active correspondence, but once Bossuet had entered upon the scene he and Leibnitz were left in almost exclusive possession of the stage. The correspondence between them was vigorously maintained from 1691 to 1695. Then, no doubt owing to his absorption in the controversy with Fénelon, there is a pause of three years. But with the beginning of 1699 the correspondence was again resumed and continued till February, 1702, just two years before Bossuet's death.

Now it was Bossuet's judgment in this affair that mattered, not Pellisson's or Spinola's or even that of the impulsive Innocent XI. And it is Bossuet's judgment, and as far as possible in his own words, of the acceptableness of Molanus' proposals which I propose to set before you. To the "*Regulæ*" or general rules applicable to ecclesiastical reunion Molanus had added some private reflections—the "*Cogitationes Privatæ*"—which he submitted to Bossuet as his personal view of how the *Regulæ* accepted by Spinola might be applied. This important document was divided into two parts. In the first Molanus proposed a preliminary union between the Churches and stated the conditions under which he held such a union was possible. Only after this preliminary union had been accepted were the representatives of the two Churches to meet together and proceed to a friendly conciliation of those points of doctrine on which the two Communion were in conflict. Finally, if any doctrinal differences remained over unsettled, they were to be referred to a General Council whose decisions were to be absolutely binding on all the members of the reunited Church. In the second part of the "*Cogitationes*" Molanus set forth in

detail a conciliation of the disputed points which, he claimed, would be accepted immediately by at least the great majority of members of the Lutheran Church. He divided the disputed doctrines into three classes: those in which the difference, being one of verbal definition only, could be resolved by way of further elucidation; those on which there were differences of opinion within either of the two Communion, for which class he laid down the rule that the opinion which prevailed universally in one Communion and only partially in the other should be accepted by the reunited Church; and, finally, those which would have to be submitted to the judgment of the General Council.

Now, of this second part of the "Cogitationes" Bossuet expresses his practically unreserved approval. "I see nothing more essential," he says in his reply, "nor more proper to facilitate reunion than the conciliation of our most important matters of controversy which has been accomplished by the illustrious and learned author. If the sentiments of M. Molanus are followed, reunion is achieved or almost achieved. Nothing remains for him to do save to procure the avowal of his doctrine among his own party in order to prove conclusively that the reunion which he proposes presents no difficulty." But on the proposed method of procedure Bossuet was adamant. He would have nothing to do with Molanus' preliminary union by which the Lutherans were as a Communion to recognize the Pope as chief of all bishops both in order and dignity and as Sovereign Patriarch and to render all the obedience due to him in spiritual things, to recognize the order of the Catholic hierarchy, and to acknowledge all Roman Catholics as brethren notwithstanding their communicating in one kind only, on condition that the Pope would recognize as members of the true Church all those Protestants who would submit to the ecclesiastical hierarchy and the future Council, though continuing their demand for communion in both kinds, their objection to private Masses, and their requirement that the marriages of the clergy should be held to be legitimate. It was not to these conditions in themselves that Bossuet objected. On them he was quite ready to transact. His objection was to the whole idea of the preliminary union as an illogical method of procedure. Submission to the Pope, he argued, meant acceptance of the faith of which the Pope was guardian. It would be absurd to offer or receive such submission before it had been clearly determined what that faith was. There speaks Bossuet's robust honesty and common-sense. It might have been expected that he would welcome Molanus' proposal of a preliminary union which meant in effect a preliminary submission of the Lutherans to the Roman Church. But no, such submission ought not to

be offered as it ought not to be received until agreement on matters of faith had been reached. For Bossuet truth and conscience are before unity and order.

Yet, as we have seen, and as we shall see more fully presently, he had accepted practically in its entirety Molanus' conciliation of controverted doctrines. I can hardly make plain the measure of Bossuet's acceptance without giving in some detail the substance of Molanus' conciliation. You will remember that his first class of controverted questions was that on which he held that disagreement was only verbal, a difference as he put it rather of words than of things. Of such questions he gives ten examples—the Sacrifice of the Mass, the nature of the intention required in administering a Sacrament, the number of the Sacraments, the effect of justification upon the sinner, whether faith is the sufficient instrument of justification, assurance of justification and perseverance, the possibility of fulfilling the Law, whether the first or involuntary movements of concupiscence or natural desire and the other sins which are called venial are to be regarded as violations of the Divine Law, the nature of good works, and whether the good works of the regenerate are pleasing to God. On all these points Molanus shows clearly that there is substantial agreement between all well-informed and moderate theologians of the two Communions. His general method is to state the doctrine as moderately explained by one side and then to quote recognized theologians of the other who have accepted the explanation as sufficient.

The second class of questions, you will remember, embraces all those which are universally believed in one Communion, but about which there is disagreement among members of the other. Molanus requires that the doctrine held universally in one Communion and by a section only of the other shall be accepted by the reunited Church. He gives six examples. The Roman Church as a whole approves of prayers for the dead. A part of the Lutheran Church, relying on the teaching of the Apology for the Confession of Augsburg, approves and practises the custom. In the Reunion Assembly, therefore, the Lutherans agree to range themselves as a whole in support of this doctrine and practice. A part of the Roman Church approves, while another reproves, the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin. Since the Lutheran Church in its entirety rejects the doctrine, the Roman representatives are asked for the sake of a healing peace to abandon it altogether. On the question of the merit of good works, opinion in the Roman Church is divided. Scotus maintains that the good works of the regenerate are not meritorious in themselves, but

only because of God's free acceptance of them, which acceptance has been directly guaranteed by the Divine promise. Vasquez and his Jesuit followers, on the other hand, hold that the good works of the just, apart from any promise of God to accept them, establish of themselves a right to eternal life. Now, since, on the admission of Vasquez himself, all Protestants hold an opinion on this point which is in fundamental agreement with the Scotist doctrine, that doctrine ought to be accepted by the Roman side as part of the basis of union. On the other hand, the whole Roman Church affirms the necessity of good works to salvation. Some Protestants deny this necessity, meaning only to deny to good works the power of procuring salvation which is a free gift of God, while others affirm their necessity, not as being of themselves operative of salvation, but as its indispensable condition in accordance with St. Paul's saying: "Without holiness no man shall see the Lord." In this sense all Protestants can accept the Roman doctrine, and ought to be willing to do so for the sake of religious peace. Again, all Protestants agree in an aversion to the adoration of the Host through the motive of a fear of idolatry. Now many Roman theologians teach that all worship offered in the Eucharist is a worship which is directed only to Jesus Christ present in the consecrated elements, while others hold that it terminates, as the theological phrase runs, in the consecrated Host. With the former teaching all Lutherans can agree, and therefore the Roman Church as a whole ought to be prepared to accept it. Again, the doctrine of Ubiquity which is held by some Lutherans and denied by others, and which is rejected by the whole Roman Church, must be entirely abandoned by the Lutherans. The final instance relates to the Decree of the Council of Trent affirming the sole authenticity of the Vulgate. Many Roman theologians have interpreted the decree as intended only to deny the existence of any error subversive of faith or morals in the Vulgate and to affirm its superiority to other Latin versions but not to the original Hebrew. If this interpretation is accepted by all Catholics, the dispute about the Vulgate is at an end.

It is in the third class of questions that difficulties of real substance will have to be faced. These are the questions which may have to be referred to the General Council because agreement on them by way of explanation seems almost beyond hope. Yet even on some of these questions the Abbot of Loccum does not despair of reaching a working agreement by way of careful preliminary explanation. And he actually attempts by this means a conciliation of the following disputed doctrines—transubstantiation, invocation of saints, the worship

of images, purgatory, the Pope's primacy as of Divine right, monastic vows, and traditions. The doctrines which in Molanus' judgment must be referred to the General Council were—the permanence of the Sacrament of the Eucharist apart from the reception of the elements, the exposition of the Host in processions or otherwise, the particular enumeration of sins in auricular confession, the number of the Canonical books, the judge of controversies, the use of the Latin language in the Mass, the notes of the Church, ecclesiastical fasts, the reading of Scripture in the vulgar tongue, indulgences, the distinction between the orders of bishops and priests as of Divine right, and the authority of the Tridentine Council.

This, then, was the document of which Bossuet could write that if the sentiments of M. Molanus were followed, reunion was achieved or almost achieved. But Bossuet carried the matter a stage—and an important stage—further. The Abbot of Loccum had put forth the "*Cogitationes*" on his own personal authority only, while believing that his opinions were shared by a majority of the theologians of his own Communion. Bossuet undertook to prove that Molanus had advanced nothing which was not fully borne out by the official standards of the Lutheran faith—viz., the Confession of Augsburg with Melancthon's Apology, the Schmalcaldic Articles, and Luther's Little Confession. Luther had contended that the Roman Church by its doctrine of merit denied the purely gratuitous character of justification, the fact that it was always a free, unmerited gift of God, and denied also the saving power of faith and of the confidence which the sinner ought to have in the pure loving-kindness of God and in the saving merits of Jesus Christ. On these points Bossuet asserts that the official doctrine of the Church is entirely at one with that which Luther claimed to have recovered from the overlaid or forgotten treasure of Augustinian doctrine. He quotes from the Decree of the Council of Trent: "Of all those things which precede justification, whether faith or good works, none can merit it. Otherwise grace would not be grace. Therefore we are bound to believe that remission of sins is not and never has been granted otherwise than as a free gift of the Divine mercy on account of Jesus Christ."

But have good works, then, no merit, and have the Lutherans denied all merit to them? The truth is that the Lutherans admit merit in good works, and admit it in exactly the same sense and under the same conditions as the Catholics do. For both deny the quality of merit to good works done before justification. Both affirm it in good works done after. They both accept the dictum of St. Augustine who asks, "Have then

the just no merits?", and answers, "They have certainly merits because they are now just, but they had none in order to be made just." And, again, they both agree in their conception of how the good works of the justified are meritorious, of what it is that they merit, and of why they possess that merit. The Catholic doctrine on these points, says Bossuet, is adequately expressed in the definitions of the Confession of Augsburg, where it is stated that "good works are true acts of worship and meritorious, because they deserve recompense both in this life and in the eternal life"; that the nature of the recompense thus deserved is in this life the augmentation of grace; and that the reason why good works possess merit at all is because, following upon justification, they are not merely human works, but authentic effects of Divine grace.

But what of the contention of some Catholic theologians that the good works of the justified do of themselves establish a claim to eternal life? Bossuet rejects the opinion with horror as contrary to the authentic tradition of the Church. The Council of Trent had again decided, in full conformity with the view for which the Lutherans contended, that "eternal life is a grace mercifully promised to the children of God on account of the merits of Jesus Christ, and a reward which will be granted to their merit and good works by reason of that promise only." And Bossuet underlines each particular of this decision in a strictly Lutheran sense—that eternal life is a grace, a free gift of God's loving favour, not a reward naturally or legally due to certain acts; that it is a promise of God's forgiving mercy, not an attainment of man's righteousness; that it is given through Jesus Christ and on account of His merits only; and, finally, that if it can be said to be accorded to the good works and merits of the justified, it is only in virtue of God's promise and of His mercy and grace which have made those works possible. At one point only in the Lutheran cycle of grace doctrines does Bossuet express hesitation, their claim to assurance of justification. The Lutheran argument ran: Justification is a grace of God accorded to faith. Now a man knows whether he believes or not, whether he has that perfect confidence in God's promises which enables God to fulfil those promises. Therefore, if he possesses that faith, he knows with an infallible certainty that he is justified. But Bossuet points out that the Lutherans reject the parallel Calvinist doctrine of assurance of eternal salvation. In other words, they assert that it is possible for a man to be fully assured that he is at present just in the sight of God, but deny to him any assurance that he will remain so. Bossuet therefore asks the Lutherans to extend the logic of their denial of assurance of eternal salva-

tion to their affirmation of assurance of being justified. If a man cannot be sure that he will satisfy all the conditions on which God will fulfil His promise of eternal life, let it be admitted also that he cannot be sure of having satisfied all the conditions of a true faith on which it depends whether God will make him just. This extension of their own logic will bring the Lutherans completely into line with the Catholics on every minutest point of this great question of justification.

When we come to the Eucharistic cycle of doctrine there is, in Bossuet's opinion, even less difficulty of conciliation. On the question of the Real Presence, he says: "There is much reason for gratitude to God that this article has among the Lutherans remained entire and inviolable—a fact which reveals a special providence destined to facilitate their return. For they believe, as we do, in the Reality of the Presence, in Jesus Christ present in His entirety, in His body and blood, soul and divinity." As to Transubstantiation, Molanus had stated that the Lutherans, affirming as they did the Real Presence of Jesus Christ, concerned themselves but little as to the manner in which it was procured. There was, however, complete agreement among them that consecration effects in the elements some change in virtue of which the bread, though without being changed in its substance, ceases to be common bread and becomes a sacred Bread which to those who receive it is the communion of the Body of Christ. He therefore begs the Catholics, without entering into the question of the manner in which the change of bread and wine in the Eucharist is effected, to be satisfied to say with the Lutherans that that manner is incomprehensible and inexplicable, that nevertheless it is of such a kind that the bread becomes by some secret and wonderful change the Body of Jesus Christ. Bossuet replies: "There is no longer any difficulty on this article if the belief of the author that in the Eucharist a mysterious change is effected by the words of institution, whereby the statement of the Fathers that the bread is the Body of Jesus Christ becomes true, is shared also by his co-religionists." And he adds: "We readily accede to the author's request that, without entering into the manner in which this change is wrought, we should content ourselves with saying that by a secret and inexplicable change the bread becomes the Body of Jesus Christ."

As to the perpetual Presence in the Eucharist—i.e., the presence apart from the reception of the consecrated elements—Bossuet holds that this doctrine is sufficiently guaranteed among the Lutherans by their belief that the Presence is an immediate effect of consecration in virtue of the words of institution being used, and that it is indeed directly authorized

by the adoption of the formula of the Greek Mass in the Apology for the Augsburg Confession and by the fact that Luther himself retained the elevation of the Host as a witness to the Presence of Jesus Christ.

On the question of adoration you may remember that Molanus had desired that in the reunited Church it should be taught that only Jesus Christ present in the Sacrament ought to be adored, in which opinion all Lutherans were agreed, while the Roman Church was divided upon the question, some of its theologians holding that adoration was due to the consecrated species. Bossuet replies that Molanus' requirement has already been satisfied by the authoritative decision of the Council of Trent that adoration is due to the Sacrament in so far as it contains that same God of whom it is written, "And let all the angels of God worship Him." In that sense, says Bossuet, Luther till the very end of his life spoke of the Sacrament as adorable, and in that sense also and no other do Catholics offer adoration in the Eucharist, even though there be some writers who may talk of adoring the species in their accidental relation to the Divine Presence.

With regard to the Eucharistic Sacrifice, again, there was no difficulty. Bossuet's statement of the doctrine in his *Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church*, written nearly a quarter of a century earlier, was acceptable not only to Lutheran but to Calvinist theologians. As he had written long ago to Ferry, the reformed pastor of Metz: "We do not think that the victim which we present in the Eucharist must be effectually destroyed anew" (that was the contention of Bellarmine), "because the Son of God has once for all abundantly satisfied this obligation by the sacrifice of the Cross, in such wise that the sacrifice of the Eucharist being established in commemoration, only a mystic death and destruction are to be sought therein, representing the actual death which the Son of God once suffered for us."

There remained only two further Eucharistic questions for settlement: private Masses and Communion in one kind. In neither of these was there any practical difficulty. For in spite of the aversion of the Lutherans to Masses without communicants, it was still a constant and received practice in their churches for the pastors to communicate by themselves when no others were present, though the case was no doubt regarded as one of necessity. And with regard to the other point, Communion in both kinds was a concession to Lutheran practice which Bossuet was willing to make, so far as the Lutherans only in the reunited Church were concerned. But it was characteristic of Bossuet that he could not be satisfied with a prac-

tical concession until he had placed it on some clear ground of principle. He would force Molanus to acknowledge, on grounds common to them both, the general lawfulness both of private Masses and of Communion in one kind. In their aversion to Masses without communicants as in their restoration of the cup to the laity, the Lutherans had been determined by the religious necessity of adhering to the exact manner of institution as described in the Gospel. But it is clear, says Bossuet, that you do not always adhere to it. Otherwise you could never under any circumstances allow yourselves under the plea of necessity to celebrate without communicants, since it is certain that in the original institution Christ did not alone eat the heavenly bread. Again, you do not practise the fraction nor do you think it necessary, though the actual breaking of the bread was a part of the mystery as instituted. Therefore you agree with us that not everything that Jesus Christ said, did, or instituted is of the substance of the institution. That substance of the Sacrament is, as you yourselves expressly declare, Jesus Christ present under each species in His Body and Blood, His soul and divinity, in the wholeness of His Person. And the sole means of procuring that Presence is the use of the words of consecration over the elements. Bossuet can therefore confidently appeal to the Lutherans for a recognition of the Catholic Communion in one kind as permissible and legitimate.

Closely connected with the Eucharistic doctrines as, like them, affecting worship were three others—the invocation of the saints and the reverence paid to them, the reverence paid to images, and prayer and oblation for the dead. On the first of these questions Bossuet affirms that no other conciliation is needed than that which Molanus had proposed—viz., that the Catholics should declare that they do not pretend to ask for the prayers of the saints who are with God in any other sense than they ask the same from the saints who are still upon the earth. This, says Bossuet, we do emphatically declare to be our doctrine, and whether we ask for the prayers of those saints who are with God or of those upon earth, we do it only because we know that God grants much to their prayers, a consideration which adds to our sense of His loving-kindness and leaves intact His sovereign greatness and the worship due to Him.

On the matter of the worship of images Bossuet again concludes that no difficulty remains. The Lutherans had reproved the image-breakers and had retained the images in their churches both as pious memorials and as apt to stir and refresh their memory of holy things. "That," says Bossuet, "is already a beginning of the worship which we render to them and the

assured principle from which it is deduced." As for Molanus' requirement that, for the purpose of removing abuses, it shall be sternly forbidden to believe in any divinity or virtue in them by reason of which they may be adored, it has already been met by a decree of the Council of Trent which word for word teaches the same thing. On the question of prayer for the dead Molanus had recalled the testimony of the Apology to the nature of Lutheran doctrine. Bossuet briefly professes himself satisfied both with the permission of the practice among Lutherans and with their belief in its efficacy.

Thus on all or nearly all the controverted questions both of doctrine and worship Bossuet was either completely satisfied with the explanations of Molanus or recognized in the logic of his position a natural movement towards complete accord. The way was therefore at last open for the method of the reunion which should take place as soon as the Lutheran churches had presented to the Pope a declaration of adhesion to the points conciliated by Molanus. First of all, Bossuet rejects at once all idea of requiring from the Lutherans anything like retraction or admission of error. It will be sufficient for them to recognize the truth by way of declaration and explanation of their own formularies. The Pope will then be asked, in all those districts inhabited only by Lutherans and where there were no Catholic bishops, to consecrate as bishops the existing superintendents and to ordain the ministers as priests under their authority. In places where there were Catholic bishops already the superintendents and the ministers were to be ordained priests. The new bishoprics would be grouped under a Catholic metropolitan. Where, however, there had been a constant succession of Lutheran bishops (this would, of course, apply to the Scandinavian countries), they were to be recognized and left in possession of their sees after subscribing the agreed Confession of Faith. It is interesting to notice in passing that the apostolic succession here implied is official, not personal—the succession which passed, as Professor C. H. Turner puts it, from the holder of a see to his successor, not from consecrator to consecrated. To continue, however, care was to be taken that the Mass should be celebrated on solemn festivals with all possible decency. The Scriptures in the vulgar tongue were to be left in the hands of the people. Even Luther's version might be used on account of its elegance and clearness of expression after the removal of such additions to the text as "*Faith alone justifies.*" The Bible thus translated might be read publicly, with suitable explanations, at such times as might seem best. Those who desired to communicate should be exhorted to do so in the solemn assembly, and all instructions should be directed

in that sense; but if there were no communicants, Mass should none the less be celebrated. To those who had signed the agreed Confession of Faith the Communion was to be administered in both kinds without any further precaution; but the reverence due to the Holy Sacrament should be carefully safeguarded. The newly created dioceses and parishes should not be compelled to receive convents of monks or nuns; but it was hoped that by their purity of life and by recovering the primitive spirit of their institution the monastic orders might in time recommend themselves to the Lutheran portion of the reunited Church equally with the Roman. From the worship of the Saints and of images everything which savoured of superstition or of sordid gain was to be removed. Everything in this matter was to be regulated according to the decrees of the Council of Trent, and the bishops were to exercise the authority which the Council had given them on this head. The public prayers, the Missal, the Ritual, and the Breviary, were to be corrected by the removal of all things doubtful, suspect, or superstitious, so that everything therein might savour of the ancient and solid piety. Finally, if it should prove feasible, an Ecumenical Council should be called for the perfect reformation of discipline and the reduction of those who might still remain in schism, to which Council the articles of reform which the Emperor Ferdinand and Charles IX. of France had attempted to place before the Council of Trent should be submitted and all regard which the conditions of times and places would permit be at length paid to them. "Thus," Bossuet concludes, "we shall effect the Reformation of the Church in the true spirit in which it ought to be undertaken, preserving unity without changing the doctrine of preceding centuries, and removing abuses."

I must crave your forgiveness alike for the length of this narrative and for its monotonous detail. But only by an elaborately detailed statement of the agreed points of doctrine and of the practical proposals for reunion could I hope to show you how near to each other, in the opinion of some of their most considerable theologians, the Roman and Lutheran Churches were at that moment in all essential matters of doctrine and practice. And yet these negotiations came to nothing. We cannot even see clearly where or how they came to an end. Their current, for long broad and generous, simply disappears in the sands. The last clearly visible trace of them is the long-drawn-out correspondence of Bossuet and Leibnitz over the ecumenicity of the Council of Trent. Why did they fail? Chiefly because there was no enthusiasm behind them, no popular demand for them, on either side. They produced hardly a ripple on the surface of contemporary history. That strange

tragic figure, the Odescalchi Pope, Innocent XI., was, I think, really and deeply interested, but besides him only Spinola and a few converted Lutherans among Roman theologians. Even Bossuet's interest was mainly intellectual, and though for a time vivid never reached the point of enthusiasm. On the Lutheran side there was the real enthusiasm of Leibnitz and the Helmstädt theologians, backed by the not very clearly motivated political manoeuvres of the court of Hanover. And then, besides, Bossuet and those who thought and acted with him represented, though they did not realize it as yet, the past in the Roman Church. The solid piety, the chastened Augustinian orthodoxy for which they stood, were rapidly giving way before the combined onset of new forces of very various kinds—the critical history of Petavius and Simon, the moral casuistry of the Jesuits, a growth of popular devotions theologically of the most questionable character which were to make of the reforming decrees of the Council of Trent even more of a dead letter than they were already. And on the Lutheran side also popular religion was just beginning to displace theological interest in the emergence of the Pietistic movement. Spener, its founder, was one of the few audible voices of protest on the Lutheran side against the negotiations. And all this points to the power of the populace in religion, a power which represents group temperament and not learned thought. At that last moment of vital vigour of the old Scholastic theology it was natural enough that the more conservative theologians of both the Lutheran and the Roman Churches, who both derived from it, should feel themselves to be practically at one. But the Churches had been separated for a century and a half, long enough to develop very distinct and growingly antipathetic temperaments. For Churches are not primarily schools of theology. They are before everything else spiritual climates, determining the souls of men by all the subtle and unanalyzable forces of religious soil and atmosphere. And in virtue of that uncontrollable fact Lutheranism was moving towards individual pietism, Rome towards a labour-saving authority in matters of faith and the unregulated jungle-growth of Jesuit devotion. Would unity, if it had been politically possible, have arrested that tendency? And might it not even have sterilized theology? Was the decent Thomism which it would have canonized as the theology of the reunited Church the last effective or the sole sufficient effort of the Christian religion to understand itself? But the question is idle, for Molinism had already triumphed over it in the Roman Church and Arminianism in the Churches of the Reform. But the question is also otiose in another sense, for it is not a common theology that will ever unite Churches,

but a common spiritual temperament. And if that is a hard saying in that it seems to rebuke all hope of reunion between Churches which are already deeply separated by temperament, it is also a counsel of practical wisdom against the further schism which would create new zones of mutual exclusion or at least of difficult understanding in what can still be recognized as the one universal obedience to the Lord Christ.

A. L. LILLEY.

UNITY IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND *

IF one's vision of Anglicanism were restricted to its present condition in England alone, one might feel tempted to suspect the possibility of its continued cohesion. Dissidence, both in teaching and in practical policy, appears so obvious that even a sober critic might be excused if he regarded it as the true inwardness and fruit of the three movements or schools of thought which have stirred the blood of the Church of England during the last century and a half. He would admit that all three had been present in it, at least in germ, from the Reformation onwards, and that they had in fact contributed to the remarkable increase in the depth, influence, and expansiveness which can be discerned in the Church's life for the last few generations. But the fact that these movements have proved to be contributory to this process is the result, he would say, not of any principle of Anglicanism in itself, but of the fact that they have been compelled to function in a system of which the real guardian has been the State. In other words, what has held the Church together has been the Establishment. The prodigious controversy of the last few years has shown that these movements, forced as they have been into fruitful collaboration by the Establishment, are in principle centrifugal; and in the long run the truth will out.

We are familiar with the argument; but, as I have said, it is one which depends almost wholly upon the restriction of our field of vision to our own country. Once realize that the Church of England is only a part—though no doubt a very important part—of the Anglican Communion as a whole and the introduction of the Establishment as a kind of *Deus ex machina* is seen to be beside the point. Anglican unity exists on a large scale in many parts of the world, without any assistance from the State; and it in no way bears the appearance of being a mere reflection of what exists in England.

* A paper read at the meeting of the Anglican Fellowship in July, 1928.

You will pardon me, I hope, if I draw somewhat largely for the purposes of this paper on impressions of Anglicanism derived from a recent visit to the United States and Canada; there are probably some here who can speak from experience of our Communion in other overseas countries, and it will be interesting to see whether our testimony is concordant. But no one, I think, can visit the North American continent without coming back with fresh enthusiasm for the Church, and feeling that Anglican unity exists, and exists in its own right and by virtue of its own intrinsic principles. In Washington, for instance, where I spent the best part of a week with fifty clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church drawn from all parts of the United States, the unity of the gathering was something one can never forget. Not that there was any clipping of wings: every shade of theological opinion and of devotional practice which we know in the Church of England was represented there, with the exception of Erastianism; High Churchmen of the *Lux Mundi* School, Anglo-Catholics of the right and of the left, pronounced Modernists or "Liberals," as they are called, Evangelicals old and new, *χωτὶ τῶν μεταίχμιον* (to use Æschylus's phrase). But all these marked differences of tradition and outlook were reconciled and resolved into a unity of Churchmanship which left room for all and yet was far greater than any. In the light of this experience, I was not surprised when I was assured, as I was by more than one diocesan bishop, that the supply of Ordination candidates had never been so encouraging, either in quantity or in quality, as during the last few years.

That fact alone is so much at variance with our own experience in England that it challenges attention. It is natural to suggest, perhaps, that it is in part due to the stipends of the clergy being better in America than in England. But, so far as I could gather, that is not at all the case. The average income of a Rector would appear to be from £300 to £400 a year; in the West many of the clergy are really poor. In any case, when regard is had to the immense emoluments to be reaped in other lines of life, we may safely say that financial inducements play no part whatever in the recruiting of the Ministry. And there is surely no better test of the Church's health, and the power of its appeal than its capacity for awakening and using vocation in its young University men.

Or, again, it may be urged that the authority of the parson is not the unfettered thing in America that it sometimes is here, and that the greater powers of the laity have a wholesome effect on the whole Church. But that, too, would be to misread the facts. A Rector's position in America is to all intents and purposes a freehold. He has complete control over the

services; he cannot be dismissed except for certain definite offences; and his stipend is a first charge, legally binding and enforceable as a contract, on the vestry.

I think we may safely say that the nation-wide appeal which Anglicanism is making to Americans today cannot be explained along any lines of this kind, and that the sources of its strength lie in the thing itself.

And first of all I would set those root principles which Anglicanism shares with the rest of the Catholic Church—its Creeds, its ordered and graded Ministry, its liturgical tradition. In the welter of politics and propaganda which absorbs the energies of so much American religion, dogma and liturgy offer a quiet witness to the truths and realities of the spiritual world as things to be desired for their own sake alone. These features of the Church's life are a guarantee that God is not simply a name to bless some cause with, but the supreme and prevenient Reality, ever to be worshipped and adored. "He that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." Only in such a soil can either Christian theology or Christian morality take root and grow. Without it the temptation is overwhelming to regard the problem of truth in religion as one that has no concern for ordinary people, and to forget that the reason has an indispensable function among the duties of religion; while the centre of ethical interest is shifted from the task of building character to the far easier one of making laws. Therein lies the danger of all schemes of Federalism, even though Prohibition and a reduced Navy vote be inscribed on its colours. The Episcopal Church can point to no such spectacular achievements; no tremor seizes Congress when it speaks; but for that very reason, just because it keeps aloof from direct action in politics, and occupies itself with those deeper tendencies of thought and life which lie below the surface of society, it commands the ever-growing respect and affection of considering men and women. We were right, no doubt, to go to Stockholm; but we were only right because we were already pledged to Lausanne and to Malines.

But it is a commonplace that the Church of England not only holds the faith and principles of the Church Catholic, but holds them in a particular balance, proportion, and temper. It is a reformed Church, comprehensive, at once Catholic and Evangelical. Good: but let us be careful not to be content with phrases. "A reformed Church"—but so also is the Church of Rome. I must not dwell on this point: but I believe it to be quite cardinal to any just estimate of Christian history. When, for instance, you compare the French Church of today with that

of the fourteenth century, or contrast modern monasticism with that described by Dr. Coulton, or the Roman Church of modern Quebec with that of mediæval Florence, it is impossible to deny that the Counter-Reformation was itself a branch of the Reformation; and the conclusion is reinforced when you consider also the magnificent humanitarian labours of Las Casas in Mexico and Spain or of the Franciscans in California, as the rights of native races were more and more threatened by invaders from the Old World or the New. But I must not pursue that argument.

Let us turn to the other term, "comprehensive." More than any term, perhaps, in our vocabulary of Anglican claims, it needs attention; for there, if anywhere, lies the secret of our unity. In itself, of course, the mere fact of comprehending differences, irrespective of the principle of their comprehension, is of little consequence. Rome does it to an amazing degree, on the basis of loyalty to a central institution; the Protestant "Community Church" of some garden city does it likewise, on the basis of common *habitat*. There is nothing remarkable about a vessel that will contain black peas as well as green. What is remarkable is a process of culture that will produce a new stock from the fusion of these two types. In other words, our comprehensiveness means little if it does not mean synthesis; not the mere juxtaposition of Evangelical and Catholic, but the intermarriage of their principles, so that the resulting issue partakes of both.

Let us define, then. In speaking of the comprehensiveness of Anglicanism, we mean that it is both Catholic and Evangelical, in the sense that it interprets Catholicism in the light of the New Testament and the Gospel in the light of Catholic experience. "Catholicism in the light of the New Testament": let us take that side first. The Reformation in the Church of England was historically a testing and revision of Catholic tradition in the light of the rediscovered Greek Testament. The Gospel thus released from its shrouds was recognized at once as in many ways sharply at variance with the Church men knew. They could find nothing there corresponding to the single, direct, and unconditioned jurisdiction of the Papacy, to the rigid system of Canon Law, to the commerce in pardons and prayers, to the intricacies of rite and language which were supposed to mediate the Gospel of life. A new liberty of the spirit was called in to revive the life which a corrupt and over-reaching institution was smothering, and to restore a balance between authority and freedom which should never have been lost.

But the obverse of this process was no less characteristic

of the English Reformation. The Gospel and the newly translated Scriptures which enshrined it were not so simple that men could afford to dispense with the gathered wisdom of the past. If the Gospel was not simply a proclamation to the winds but a concrete way of life, then what men had made of it in the past was of capital importance; the testimony of the saints, the researches of theologians, and, above all, the Church's devotional experience in many lands and over many centuries, could not be neglected. That is why Hooker has one whole front of his apologetic turned towards rebutting the claims of "private judgment." That claim was not only in itself arrogant and foolish; it involved a conception of Christianity which in the long run must mean its complete divorce from the actual conduct of life. The issue is well exemplified in the difference between the Catholic and Protestant doctrines of justification, the one finding it in the real imparting, the other in the mere imputation, of righteousness; and few of us, I imagine, would dissent from Dr. Rashdall's judgment as to the ethical and religious superiority of the former.

Anglican unity, then, springs from and presupposes a synthesis and fusion between Catholicism and Evangelicalism, in the sense that Catholicism is received, interpreted, and revised in the light of the Gospel, and the Gospel received, interpreted, and applied in the light of Catholic experience. It claims no exclusive title to the possession of this principle, which has operated, no doubt, in different measures and at different periods both in Roman and in Protestant Christianity; but in Anglicanism alone has it been explicit. In such a marriage, the high contracting parties will sometimes, of course, assert their independence. Mendel has shown that, if two stocks possessing different characteristics—of sweet peas, for instance, or of dancing mice—be cross-bred, the result over several generations is the production not only of hybrids, but also of each of the original types as well; though the hybrid form will be in each generation (after the first) as numerous as the other two put together. Moreover, a half even of those that appear to be of the original type will in fact prove on testing to be hybrids. The history of the Church of England presents the spectacle of a kind of ecclesiastical Mendelism. The two original types, the Catholic and the Protestant, are still found in their purity in each generation, and are still an essential part of the stock; but the synthesis never fails to reappear and transmit itself as age succeeds to age.

This synthetic spirit, which is surely the true genius and meaning of Anglicanism, shows itself in a number of ways. Our tradition of ecclesiastical discipline, for example, affords an

illustration. "The fast before Communion is set before men as an ancient and laudable practice, but it is not made obligatory. Fast days are enacted, but detailed regulations as to their observance are not given. Auricular confession is provided for, but not required at all universally. Attendance at Mass is not declared to be a necessary method of observing Sundays and Holy Days,"* though special Collects, Epistles and Gospels are provided. Catholic standards are set, that is to say, but the individual is left a large latitude in his conformity to them.

A second illustration may be drawn from contemporary theology. Thus, Dr. Barnes and Professor Bethune-Baker represent a type of Christology which claims to have made credible once more the doctrine of the Incarnation. The truth that Christ is the perfect mirror of the Father, identically both God and man, is grounded on the appeal which His character makes to the conscience, and is explained by saying that the divine and human are not really distinct; there is an incarnation of God in all men. Leaving aside the question whether this deification of man is compatible with the teaching of Scripture, one may admit that this doctrine would go far to justify and account for the attitude of worship towards our Lord taken by the Church from the beginning. But is that all? The Incarnation was not a theophany, but an *ἐνανθρώπησις*; not only a "descent" of the Godhead into man, but a taking up of the manhood into God. Ethical admiration for our Lord can go far, as it went far in Galilee; but it was the faith in the Resurrection and Ascension which made Christianity. If the Modernist faith in Christ "offends," it is not as error but as half-truth; the individual's appreciation of what Christ was needs to be balanced and interpreted by what He has been and is in the Church's experience. He does not only reveal humanity: He also recreates it, exalts it to the heavenly places, and gives it immortal life.

Again, we have heard much in recent months of the Real Presence in the Eucharist: is it objective and outside the worshipper, or is it in the heart of the devout recipient? Surely Scripture refuses any such dilemma. I take at random a verse from the Book of Ezekiel. "Then I arose, and went forth into the plain: and, behold, the glory of the Lord stood there, as the glory which I saw by the river of Chebar: and I fell on my face. Then the spirit entered into me, and set me upon my feet, and spake with me, and said unto me, Go, shut thyself within thy house." There you have fused, in one moment of experience, the characteristic attitudes of Catholic and Evangelical piety at Communion—the abasement before the

* "W. S." in the *Church Times*, April 20th, 1928.

"glory" or presence of the Lord regarded as "there," and the sense of the Spirit entering and empowering and sending forth. Why should we divide what God has joined together? Each attitude will have its special discipline and method of expression; but unity must lie in their cohesion.

The Word and the Church—is their synthesis the conclusion of the matter? If so, it is only because both are the immediate vestures of the Christ, and it is only in so far as He is sought and found through both that unity is realized and expressed. This is only another way of saying that the source and centre of Anglican unity is, and must be, in the last resort, the living Christ Himself. A truism, but a not unneeded truism. It is a fact too often forgotten that when Anglicans get together for the plain work and devotion of the Church—in parish or rural deanery or diocese—this unity is recognized and felt in the measure in which devotion to our Lord is dominant. "By whomsoever, by whatsoever method, so only Christ be preached"—that motto (paraphrasing St. Paul) does, I think, describe honestly the spirit of the Church of England.

But now, if this be a fair account of Anglican principles, certain consequences would seem to follow in their application; and here again I shall beg leave to refer to America. Our American brethren constitute a small body in a mighty nation, and they have no civic privileges as compared with other Churches. They are thus naturally realists. Surrounded by every kind of eccentricity in belief and conduct, they realize the plain differences between membership and non-membership of the Church; and they are prepared to give a fair trial to any experiment which shows promise of bringing men to Christ. Experiment—that is the keynote of America today, in business, in architecture, in education, in social legislation. Does it answer? they ask; does it get across? And religion is no exception to the rule.

Anglicanism would seem to offer a uniquely good soil for such experiment; for episcopacy ensures that it will be scrutinized and guided by authority at each stage. At any rate, that would appear to be the policy which the Episcopal Church has for some time adopted. The Bishop of Vermont wrote some months ago to *The Times* to point out that the formularies of the American Church did not permit of Reservation. That is true; but it is because the time is not yet ripe for formularies; the matter is still in the experimental stage. And this stage occasions no bitter controversy. In Trinity Church, for example, the old church at the head of Wall Street founded by William III., the Blessed Sacrament is reserved in a side-chapel. The Rector, who would not be regarded as a party man, told me that he

had found continuous Reservation a necessity for his parochial work, and had therefore introduced it without any friction two years ago. He went on to say that no question could arise as to giving it up; for there was never an hour on weekdays now when there were not people in that Chapel, usually six or seven, and the majority men, saying their prayers. The Rector claimed to be entirely innocent of this result; it had simply happened, and his attitude was one of rejoicing that what he had done for one purpose had proved to have spiritual results quite outside his intentions. Pragmatism, you may say: but the pragmatism which says that what withdraws men into a most sacred Presence, and helps them to pray, is good—that surely is unexceptionable. “By their fruits ye shall know them.” But, secondly, if experiment of this kind is to be fruitfully used by the Church, it must be given a fair trial. By all means let every care be taken to ascertain the mind of the Church as a whole, before the Church as a whole is pledged either to approve or to condemn. But when that has been done, then let loyalty to the Church have its perfect and unfettered work. In other words, I cannot doubt that one of the main causes of the strength and unity of the Church in America is its spiritual autonomy, and that one of the main causes of the weakness and disunity of the Church in England is its spiritual bondage.

Bondage—yes, indeed, when we think of the expulsion of the Non-Jurors; of Sir Robert Walpole’s deliberate attempt to degrade the standards of Church life through the abuse of patronage; of the continual refusals of English Governments to allow bishops to be consecrated in England for America;* of the drag put on the development of the Colonial Churches in the last century; of the policy behind the Public Worship Regulation Act—when we think of these things, we cannot deny that it is bondage. How can friends be agreed, when they are not free agents, but have got to draw up their agreement with one eye to the favour of another, and an alien, party? How can the Church function, when it is possible for any section in it to call in the massed battalions of the ignorant to retrieve a cause which has been lost in the Church Assembly?

I do not wholly regret Parliament’s rejection of the Prayer Book; it seems to me a just Nemesis on the Church for submitting its forms of worship to the judgment of Cæsar.

It will have done its work if, but only if, it leads us to say, “Never again,” and to resolve that the Church of England shall have the same spiritual liberties as the Church of Scotland.

Finally, something needs to be said, I think, as to the contribution—the indispensable contribution—which theology has

* Though it must be admitted that the Virginia gentry were equally to blame.

to make to the maintenance of our domestic unity. If the Act of Uniformity has become obsolete as an instrument of discipline, all the more need that its place should be taken by that interior discipline of the mind, will, and heart, which it is theology's function to supply. In other words, the Church must teach its clergy. Inevitably during the last few years administrative problems have taxed our energies to an unusual degree; the Assembly is a new instrument for dealing with them, and we are naturally using it. But it would be the height of folly to suppose that any administrative measures—such as the multiplication of archdeacons or the division of dioceses, or even new rubrics in Bishops' hands—can bring about a unity which must be in the mind if it is to bear fruit in the Church. What we have to realize is that to each school of thought it is given to realize, in Lord Irwin's fine phrase, "only a fraction of the mystery" of the Being and Love of God revealed in Christ. Theology's task is to understand and interpret each to other—and yet to maintain the mystery of the whole; and it is a task in which scholars and teachers of every school have an equal share. So far as this work is being done at present, it is being done under almost overwhelming difficulties; the authorities make no provision for theologians in their scheme of things, and the clergy are never recalled from their routine of pastoral work or their ties of party affiliation. What we need is schools of theology in every diocese which it will be a normal part of men's ministry to attend, and from which the light of a generous knowledge will radiate into every parish. It is an old story that the quarrels of Churchpeople are usually over details, not principles; and the reason is that, when the mind reaches principles, it gains a new breadth and sympathy. Does it not follow that greater unity will come by greater knowledge?

E. G. SELWYN.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

We have received a copy of *Voluntary Clergy Overseas*, by the Rev. Roland Allen. The book is privately printed, but may be had from the author (price 2s. post free) at Amenbury, Beaconsfield, Bucks. Mr. Allen seems to us to make out a strong case, and one which might well appear on the Agenda of the Lambeth Conference in 1930. No one can pass through the great spaces of Canada without realising the urgency of the pastoral problem there; and Mr. Allen's contention that it can only be met by ordaining to the priesthood men of tried character who would still continue in their civil avocations deserves every consideration. Perhaps the right body to take up the question would be the Fellowship of the Maple Leaf.

The second part of Mr. Ferrar's article on Clement of Rome will be published in November. The October issue will contain the complete papers submitted to the second Conference of English and German theologians, held last month at the Warburg. The subject is Christology. Our readers will remember the papers of the first Conference of this kind held at Canterbury last year, which were published in May, 1927. The October number will also contain a review by Dr. Mozley of the new volume of Christological essays edited by Dr. Rawlinson.

We should be glad to hear of any subscriber who would be willing to send his copies of THEOLOGY to a missionary in Africa, and will send the name and address on application.

We were interested to hear recently from a correspondent in Japan that, in a village he had been visiting, he called on the local Christian priest, and found him engaged in translating *Essays Catholic and Critical* into Japanese.

NOTES

PRAYER BOOK REVISION: A SUGGESTION

It is easy to be wise after the event, but the Deposited Book now seems to have failed because it was both ambitious and precipitate. Ambitious, in that it devised a new liturgy, as well as other new services, and thereby made a break in devotional practice which was bound to excite great opposition. Precipitate—but how can a twenty years' course of discussion be termed precipitate? For this reason—the mass of Churchpeople were wholly ignorant of the new book, and its introduction into parishes must inevitably have seemed precipitate. Even those who liked the book felt grave misgivings at times. Nothing is so permanent as a provisional settlement, and the new services might well have lasted out the lifetime of any of us by reason of the difficulties facing a further revision. And yet they might have proved unsuitable when actually used. A grave defect in the Deposited Book was that the formidable

apparatus of State sanction and inclusion within the hallowed covers of the Prayer Book was sought for much that had never been tested by use.

There is another way, one which has been actually adopted for the first instalment of Prayer Book Revision, namely the Lectionary. In 1922 to the 1871 Lectionary was added an alternative Lectionary. It exists as an Act of Parliament. Publishers have incorporated it into their almanacks. The Privileged Presses have issued a Daily Service Book arranged according to it. Year by year the New Lectionary gains at the expense of the Old and in due course, if it were quietly substituted for the Old in reprinting the Prayer Book, no one would mind. In 1923 the new selection of Sunday Psalms was in like manner prepared for submission to Parliament but for some reason shelved.

If the precedent of the Lectionary were followed, the procedure might be as follows. The Occasional Offices could be printed as a supplementary volume which Churches could use as desired, or separately. The Confirmation Service, for example, would be printed on a leaflet for diocesan use. After twenty years, in all probability, the 1662 Service would have been entirely superseded. Then with universal consent the new service would take the place of the old in the Prayer Book. Or let us take the Baptism Service, in regard to which opinion is divided. Ten years have passed. Three-fourths of the parishes are using the new service, which is now printed in the Prayer Book instead of the old. The two change places, and the old now exists as a supplementary office which any one can use so long as he likes. The Additional Collects, Epistles, and Gospels, and Proper Prefaces could be published separately for altar use, like *The English Liturgy*, already sanctioned in many dioceses, or appear in communicants' manuals for the devout. For such instalments of Prayer Book Revision no opposition or discussion by Parliament need be feared.

The Alternative Canon—supposing, that is to say, that the 1927 Canon is to be the only alternative permitted, a course which I should personally deprecate—might be sanctioned by episcopal authority only for experimental use in private chapels and other places not cathedrals or parish churches.

In favour of such a plan I urge that it is thoroughly English. It proceeds with great caution and introduces nothing into the Prayer Book except what has been thoroughly tested and has met with nearly unanimous approval. Further, it is the actual method adopted by the Province of South Africa, where, though the Church is far more homogeneous than in England and there is no State connexion to complicate things, far more caution has been shown than in England. The Alternative Liturgy was put out in an experimental form; after five years it was revised and put on an equality with the 1662 Liturgy. The same course is being followed with the Occasional Offices. The Sechwana Version, published by S.P.C.K., is an instructive example of the method. First the Alternative Liturgy was published separately. After a while it was bound up at the end of the Prayer Book. The plates being worn out, a new edition is in preparation, in which the 1662 Service is relegated to the end of the book. Should this fall into practical desuetude, it would presumably be first omitted and sold separately to the few congregations that clung to it, and ultimately not reprinted for business reasons.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

OLD TESTAMENT ESSAYS

The papers read at the 1927 meeting of the Society for Old Testament Study are collected in a paper-covered volume of 170 pages.* They are written in English, French and German. Such a collection of small monographs by experts does not lend itself to a review, but a brief summary may be useful.

H. WHEELER ROBINSON opens with a discussion of prophetic symbolism—actions such as Jeremiah's breaking of a potter's vessel. He concludes that an original period of imitative magic passed into a later period when "the traditions of earlier usage remain by their natural momentum." The actions express in miniature the purpose of Yahweh, just as do the prophet's words. N.T. sacramentalism is based on O.T. prophetic symbolism.

G. R. DRIVER gives the evidence for the name Yahweh outside the O.T. YW was the earliest form; there was a tendency to lengthen it to YHW or YHH, the H being merely a device to ensure the pronunciation of ā, as probably in Abra(h)am; after the fifth century any form was arbitrarily selected. Thus there is no special accuracy in the familiar Yahweh.

T. H. OBBINK studies the Tree of Life in the Oriental world, where it is always forbidden. The Biblical writer in Gen. iii means that man *did* eat of it—the Tree of Knowledge was forbidden and eating it resulted in death, being driven away from the Tree of Life.

P. VOLZ has a short but very striking paper on Moses, to whom he ascribes the Decalogue. It is Moses' "Programme," far in advance of the age. Thus "Thou shalt have no other gods beside me" forbids demon-cults, a mother-goddess, private clan cults, etc. G. A. COOKE on Ezek. xxviii compares the Paradise story of that chapter with that of Gen. ii., iii.

A closely packed essay by A. LODS on magic ideas in Israelite mentality shows that in every period they subsisted as strata underlying the higher religious conceptions. B. D. EERDMANS defends the traditional critical view of Deuteronomy against the theories of Welch and others.

O. EISSFELDT treats the small literary units in O.T. narratives in a manner reminding one of the *formgeschichtlich* criticism of the Synoptic gospels.

A. CAUSSE's article on the Jewish Diaspora in the fifth century insists that Jerusalem of the second Temple was a colony of the Eastern Diaspora. It is inconceivable that Job, Proverbs, Zech. ix-xiv, Jonah, Chronicles, etc., were all composed at Jerusalem in the same *milieu* and in the same centuries. Such books were mostly products of the Diaspora, which in due course were acclimatized in Jerusalem.

There are other essays, including two on the Psalms by Gunkel and Schmidt.

W. K. L. C.

* Griffin and Co. 10s.

REVIEWS

PRIEST AND PARISH IN INDIA (EUROPEAN CONGREGATIONS).
S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

There are many who think that the most hopeful field for the building up of a body of sound Pastoral Theology is to be found in the Mission Field. Men are there more free from the dead weight of traditional conventions. They see the failure of false methods at once and they are forced to face facts.

So it was a good idea of the Bishop of Madras on behalf of the Indian Episcopate to get out a book dealing with the special circumstances of India, where the conditions of life both of the English residents and of the domiciled community are sufficiently different from those at home as to warrant reconsideration at least of our traditional English methods. The authors of the several articles are men with wide experience of life in India and a wide ground is covered. After an Introduction calling attention to some of these conditions, the book begins by trying to set forth the Ideal of a Priest in his Personal Life, as a Leader in Worship and as a Preacher and Pastor of his people, as well as considering his place in ordinary social life. The special circumstances of work among the Anglo-Indian community, in railway parishes and in planter and military chaplaincies are next considered. Then follow chapters dealing with Social Evils (prostitution, intemperance, and gambling), with School and Women's Work, and the book ends up with two excellent chapters on Business and Legal Matters.

It is, needless to say, full of good things, the outcome of direct experience and observation—*e.g.* (p. 15), "if these small matters of ceremonial have become mechanical, so much the better for your own chance of worshipping devoutly" and thinking about higher things; (p. 29), "the priest should retain hold of the cup with his own hands, but the communicant should put one hand upon it to make sure that he receives"; (p. 34), "we must learn not to give the impression that we are waiting to do something else" when people are talking to us, a thing, Marcus Aurelius says, he was grateful for having been taught; (p. 32), "at the end of two years anyone who has attended church regularly ought to have had the chance of hearing a sermon on all the great subjects—too often our sermons have no sort of connection with those that follow or precede them"; (p. 55), "too frequent exhortation to 'come to Communion' has but little effect"; (p. 60), "many of the clergy appear to be ignorant that among young men there is a fear lest their being 'on the water-cart' may be construed

as evidence that they are suffering from some form of venereal disease" (but surely that is an argument *for* total abstinence on the part of the clergy to break down this absurd idea); (p. 72), "it is extremely doubtful whether a dancing parson gives any pleasure whatever to anyone but himself"; (p. 78), "Anglican clergy have perhaps an unenviable reputation for appearing at public functions unsuitably dressed"; (p. 120), on visiting barracks "always wear clerical clothes; if you are ashamed of your uniform you can't expect the men to respect it"; "if the grouching (about Parade Service) be analyzed it will be found that the complaint is not against the service in church but against the long kit inspection and parade which precedes it"; evening service "should be made as much like a service at home as possible. There is no need for abbreviation except in the State Prayers and Exhortation—the padre will do well to get permission for the men to come in 'fatigue dress'"; (p. 126), "talk plain King's English and avoid all suspicion of slang and 'talking down' to the men—they resent it like poison"; (p. 169), "it may seem waste of time to have to convene staff meetings, or relief committees, to have to sit and listen to other people's views instead of giving a quick decision and going off to some other job. Yet it is worth while for everybody's sake"; (p. 141), the essence of gambling is the desire to get something for nothing (but why to use your "superior skill" at bridge should justify this is not quite clear); (p. 138), "distinguish between prophylactic remedies which invite men to sin, and the sympathetic treatment of the men both physically and morally after sin has brought its consequences." The whole chapter on Business is quite admirable.

It is a good sign that such a book has been compiled, and it is to be hoped that the work begun will be continued, for there is still much to be done in building up a body of scientific Pastoral Theology and raising the standard of clerical work to the level of that expected in other professions. Otherwise men who should hear the call to Holy Orders may rather hear the call to teaching or medicine because of their greater clearness and the more effective nature of their work.

And in such books as may be written in future, written as they must be by the clergy, there might well be less preaching. In an opening chapter, perhaps, it is in place, and a few words of it may well round off a chapter by way of peroration. But it wastes time and space. Of course, ours is a high calling, and we should approach our people in the spirit of love, and regard our work as a privilege, and do it in a spirit of adventure, and seek the uplift of the world, and be inspired by the Vision of lofty ideals, etc. But so should the doctor and the school-

master and the business man for the matter of that. It is surely not necessary to keep on saying it.

Again, it is valuable, no doubt, to have attention called to the problems that remain unsolved and the difficulties that have to be faced. The next step is for the people who are engaged in the work to get together to test and pool their experience. Then further books could be written with profit. But it is little use to say, for instance, that the teachers chosen should be the very best. Of course they should, but what we want to know is, what special qualities we should look for and put first. Or to say that the parish priest should draw up the religious syllabus for the school; he cannot do it without a great deal more training in teaching than most have got, and there is plenty of guidance to hand to which the teachers could probably direct them. It is no help to say "this is a very difficult problem and every priest must use his utmost discretion in approaching it." What we want is advice based on actual tackling of problems such as are contained in the chapter in this book on Business and Legal Matters, or in that on Social Evils, with its fine record of the work of the Rev. J. H. Dixon and his wife and its results.

There is considerable evidence that Church work in India is still hampered by traditions from home. So many of the old expressions that we are familiar with reappear with apparently no more testing of their soundness than we get in England. For instance, is it true that people are more ready to confide in personal friends or is a personal friend the last person you would choose for a confessor? If a barrack room is "the men's castle" and best visited only on invitation, is it right or wise to visit it without invitation? Is it the custom in India for the newcomer to wait on the older resident and for men to call on women, and, if not, should the parson go directly contrary to custom? Is there any distinction between a social and a professional visit? Does "spade work" result in a harvest or is it only suitable for a small garden? What is the experience which "shows" that an early age for confirmation is better? Does the real problem of religious teaching lie in the Sunday School or in the Week-day School? There are many indications in this book that the main problems of Pastoral Theology and the right training of the clergy to prepare them for their work are to be solved first at home.

C. F. ROGERS.

- 3 ENOCH, OR THE HEBREW BOOK OF ENOCH. Edited and translated for the first time with Introduction, Commentary, and Critical Notes, by Hugo Odeberg, Ph.D. (Lond.). Cambridge University Press. 42s.

This is a wonderfully complete and most learned *editio princeps* of a Rabbinical text of perhaps the third or fourth century, based upon a Bodleian MS. written perhaps early in the sixteenth century.

Fragments of this Hebrew Book of Enoch have long been known, principally from Jellinck's *Beth-ha-Midrasch*.

In form it differs from the First and Second Books of Enoch in that it is not attributed directly to the patriarch, and does not consist of revelations made to him in the days of his earthly life, but bears the name of Rabbi Ishmael ben Elisha, the High Priest (contemporary with R. Aqiba, early in the second century), and contains revelations made by Metatron, the translated and glorified Enoch, to him.

The course and extent of the Book, as here presented by Dr. Odeberg, are as follows:

Chapters i.-xv. are an Introduction and "Enoch-Metatron-piece" in which Metatron tells R. Ishmael of his translation and exaltation: of how the angels protested against the elevation of a mortal, and God answered them; of the tremendous privileges and attributes conferred on Metatron, so that he is above all angels (except the eight great princes—this exception may not be original), and is called the Lesser YHWH. Two additions to this section occur: ch. xv.B, which relates to the ascension of Moses into the heavens, and ch. xvi., in which we read how Elisha ben Abuya (called, after his fall into heresy, Acher), upon beholding Metatron, said that there were two Divine Powers in heaven; and consequently Metatron was degraded from his throne, and chastised. This seems out of frame with what has gone before.

Chapters xvii.-xxii., xxv.-xxviii. 6 are an angelological section with long lists of names, and infinite vain repetitions; xxii.B-xxiv. relate to the Merkabah, the heavenly chariot. From xxviii. 7 to xxxii. the subject is the Divine Judgment. With xxxiii. we return to the Merkabah: in xxxv.-xl. the celestial Qedushsha or Trisagion is described. In xli.-xlvi. A Metatron shows to R. Ishmael secrets of heaven and of the future. The other parts of ch. xlviii. seem to be additions on names of God and of Metatron, and on Enoch-Metatron.

By the time this Book was written, Jewish apocalyptic writing had sunk to the lowest point. There is in it no literary excellence whatever, and any religious value it may have is so cloaked in names and numbers as to defy extraction by any

but an expert. It is no more readable than the *Pistis Sophia* and the Books of Jeû, and that is saying a great deal.

But the presentation of it by Dr. Odeberg is quite admirable. He is perfectly at home in the cognate literature; the recesses of Rabbinism have no secrets for him. In his Introduction he shows us many interesting things. Thus: 3 Enoch (the present Book) is familiar with ideas of 1 Enoch and 2 Enoch: and, incidentally, 2 Enoch should be read in version B, not in version A, and therefore needs re-editing. There is great similarity between 3 Enoch and the Mandæan literature, but no literary dependence of one upon the other. The conception of Metatron is dealt with at great length, and it is shown to be probable that (as in ch. xvi.) there came to be opposition in some quarters to an over-exaltation of Metatron. I have wondered whether the very close resemblance of the conception in 3 Enoch to the passages cited from the later mystical literature (pp. 111-125) do not indicate a somewhat later date for the Book than is postulated by the Editor.

Then the origin of the name Metatron is discussed. Dr. Odeberg favours *μετὰ + θρόνον*: next to it "the derivation from Mithra would seem to be the most plausible" (p. 141). The other topics of the Introduction are the Angelology, the Merkabah, and the Trisagion. An Appendix suggests a connection between "the little Yao" of the *Pistis Sophia* and Metatron as the lesser YHWH.

Among many subjects of greater or less interest which are dealt with in the copious notes to the text, that of the two Messiahs, ben Joseph and ben David (pp. 144-147), will probably attract particular attention. The literature is very conveniently summarized.

The patience and the width of research among texts, which to most of us would be sand in the mouth, that have gone to the making of this stately volume are truly admirable. It is very finely turned out. The Universities of London and Upsala have subsidized the publication generously.

M. R. JAMES.

THE STORY OF JESUS AND THE BEGINNINGS OF THE CHURCH.

By Benjamin W. Bacon. Allen and Unwin. 8s. 6d.

Professor Bacon holds a somewhat unique position among contemporary New Testament scholars in America. He is a "radical" N.T. critic, who also knows and openly avows that the Christian religion is what was proclaimed by St. Paul, and is not, and never can be, adequately expressed as a doctrine of the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man. Christianity is, writes Professor Bacon, "a way of redemption

for individual sinners and for a ruined world. That is Paulinism if you will. But historically and logically also, that is Christianity." This deep-seated conviction has enabled the Professor to compose these lectures and to deliver them to various groups of American ministers, confident that he can raise, and in very large measure solve, historical problems, without in the slightest degree undermining or attenuating the Gospel, to the proclamation of which his hearers have dedicated their lives. He shows considerable sympathy with the religious aspect of Fundamentalism; but his own peculiar interest is the course of history prior to the conversion of St. Paul. Hence the subtitle of the book—*A Valuation of the Synoptic Record for History and for Religion*. It is, however, the first part of the subtitle with which the book is chiefly concerned. Professor Bacon is a critical and imaginative historian, with a very good defence for his imaginings. For his critical prolegomena the student should consult his earlier books, especially *Is Mark a Roman Gospel?*, 1919, and *The Gospel of Mark*, 1925. In the present book these are largely assumed, and he proceeds to develop in popular form, the outlines of an historical reconstruction of the origin of the Christian religion.

The theme of the book is that Peter must not be robbed in order to pay Paul. There is for the Professor quite overwhelming evidence that St. Peter stands behind St. Paul, and that the outlines of Paulinism are really Petrine—"our own line of spiritual succession goes back through Paul to Peter." The beginnings of Christianity as a new religion for humanity are therefore to be found in the vision of Peter of the Risen Christ, in his "turning again," his "stablishing of the brethren," and in his return to Jerusalem. "Peter, like Paul, saw the glory of the forgiving God and Father of his Lord in the face of Jesus Christ." The vision of Peter is the beginning of the Christian religion.

It takes the Professor three hundred and ten pages to justify this conclusion. He has to prove that all three Synoptic records are, as they stand, controlled by readings of the story of Jesus in the light of the vision of Peter and of the conversion of Paul and of subsequent history. They are religious interpretations of the life of Jesus. And, further, he has to reconstruct the actual life and teaching of Jesus in such a manner as to show the magnitude of the new beginning created by the vision of Peter. The weakness of the reconstruction is obvious. Professor Bacon never once really faces the possibility, even on the basis of the material which he recognizes as historical, that what is fundamentally both Pauline and Petrine belongs also to the teaching of Jesus. The crucial problem is the

crucifixion. The Professor cannot allow that our Lord regarded His death as in any sense the end of the Law, and he writes: "This effect of the Cross may have been in God's mind, but it certainly was not in Jesus' mind. He did not go up to Jerusalem in order to be crucified, however ready, if need be, to meet crucifixion." He therefore proposes a totally different reconstruction of the events leading to the Crucifixion. He takes the Markan narrative, and interprets it in a sense which it can hardly bear. Jesus, he says, went up to Jerusalem in order to take up the leadership of the scattered flock of Israel vacant by the death of John, and in order to bring Israel back into "loyal obedience to its national calling as servant and witness for Jehovah." In Jerusalem He finally accepted the title of Messiah as the rallying-cry to unite the people of God. The danger-point was that Jesus was in fact of the lineage of David, and if once the cry "Son of David" were raised, He would be unable either to control or to satisfy His adherents, and His death would be inevitable. This was "Satan's loophole of entry into the citadel of Jesus' defence." The cry was raised, first by Bartimæus, then by the crowds, and finally by clear implication at the regal anointing of Jesus by the unnamed woman in the house of Simon of Bethany. These cries and actions sounded the death-knell of Jesus.

Now all this is a drastic simplification, and it leaves Jesus as a national reformer, who failed in His reformation and perished in the attempt. The chasm between the Jesus of history and the Christian religion remains therefore still unbridged, for no emphasis upon the vision of Peter or upon the introduction of a subsequent revelation of a divine purpose revealed in the death of this natural reformer can take the place of a larger background to the life and death of the Jesus of history. Professor Bacon has bidden us cease robbing Peter in order to pay Paul; but we need also to be reminded that we must not in the process rob Jesus in order to pay both Peter and Paul.

It is difficult to think that Professor Bacon's reconstruction will survive further examination. But such preliminary reconstructions are of great value, as preparations for something more adequate and based upon an equally rigorous critical analysis. The book ought to be read, partly because it is exceedingly well written, partly because it contains so many good things, but chiefly because the problem has been correctly stated. The nature of the Christian religion is not the problem, but the historical events which brought it into being, and this Professor Bacon has seen with quite exemplary clarity.

EDWYN C. HOSKYNs.

NOTICES

THE UNIQUE STATUS OF MAN. By Herbert Wildon Carr, Hon. D.Litt. Macmillan. 7s. 6d.

In these lectures, delivered at the School of Religion of the University of Southern California, Dr. Wildon Carr discusses the problem of freewill in the light of modern scientific developments. After a brief survey of its history from its first emergence as a theological issue in early Christian thought, he passes to the main topic of its transformation "from a problem of the relation of the individual soul to God to the more general and yet profounder problem of the relation of the mind to nature" (pp. 8-9). Religion and theology soon give place to metaphysics, and the major part of the book is occupied with a vindication of the scope for freedom in Nature and of the consequent removal of any obstacles from the side of science to the recognition of freedom in man. If the reader is tempted to ask how this treatment conforms to the governing instruction of the lectures, which prescribes "a consideration of some timely and vital phase" of a subject "related to the development of Christian truth," he is reminded by Dr. Carr that all modern philosophy is impregnated with the spirit of Christianity, and that there is a sense in which the term "Christian" applies to Hobbes, Spinoza, and Voltaire. Thus safeguarded, the lecturer is free to range over the whole field of science and metaphysics. Dr. Carr's modern version of Monadism is familiar from his larger works to all who are acquainted with current philosophical developments. He applies its principles in these lectures to the problem of freedom, as inherent in the individuality which is ultimate everywhere in nature, with his wonted vividness and vigour of presentation. The treatment is characterized throughout by the learning and candour that we have been accustomed to find in Dr. Carr's writings. The discussion of the bearings of the theory of Relativity and of recent biological researches is admirably adjusted to the understanding of the non-scientific reader. The illustrations (*e.g.*, of the honey-bee as a type of living activity, in the closing chapter) are always relevant and illuminating. Yet we are left with the impression that Dr. Carr has not reached a solution of his problem. The freedom which he discovers and interprets lies rather in the creativeness of the cosmic *nisus* or life-force than in individual organisms; and its relation to the freewill of human agents is hardly made clear. He has shown indeed that *within* the evolutionary process there is room for freedom *somewhere*. But what we want to know is, Where? Again, is the evolutionary process, taken by itself, self-explanatory? For Dr. Carr, the passage of Nature, with its intrinsic creativeness, is all in all; he tells us nothing of what lies beyond. Yet surely here is a wider speculative problem, apart from which no adequate answer can be given to the problem of human freedom.

This book will interest the theological student as an exposition of the approach to the freewill question from the direction of positive science rather than as a study of that question in its bearings on religion and morality. The account of its origin in St. Paul's writings, given in the opening lecture, is too slight to arrest serious attention. We wish that Dr. Carr had stated his views and the grounds for them in greater detail.

We are told that Christianity stands for a new philosophy of history, of which St. Paul was the discoverer. For Dr. Carr, St. Paul is first and foremost a prophet of rationalism, who teaches, objectively, that all history is God's self-revelation as consummated in Christ, and, subjectively, the appropriation of this revelation by the believer in a free act of reason, a triumphant self-affirmation of the human spirit. This "Pauline conception of the act of faith . . . gave rise to the freewill problem and determined the form in which it first appeared in modern philosophy" (p. 27). St. Paul was assuredly a champion of spiritual liberty; but we doubt whether he would have recognized himself in this portrait of a rationalizing modernist, the precursor of the ideal of the Free Churches in contrast to that of Catholic Christianity. Of far greater interest is the account of the Jansenist controversy that quickly follows. Here Dr. Carr moves with a firmer tread, though he is not really at home till he leaves theology for metaphysic, and passes in Lecture II. to the problem of Mind and Body as presented by Spinoza and Leibnitz. From this point onwards we are guided through the tangled maze of modern scientific and philosophical speculations by a teacher who combines the gift of learning and insight with that of a lucid and delightful style.

W. G. DE BURGH.

THE ULTIMATE EPOCH AND OTHER ESSAYS. By A. J. Hubbard, M.D.
Longmans. 6s.

Here are four short essays in Theology by a thoughtful layman. The first, which gives its title to the book, is the best, and lays impressive stress on our Lord's refusal to make use of self-interest as a motive or compulsion, whether physical or moral, as a means. But he misrepresents the early Christian attitude towards the civil power. The second essay, "The Storm on the Lake of Galilee" (Jer. vi. 16 ff. and parallels), is a vindication of the traditional authorship of the Fourth Gospel, based upon novel but inadequate grounds; the third, "The Succession of the Canonical Gospels," would have benefited much by a previous reading of Canon Streeter's "The Four Gospels"; and the fourth, "The Historical Origin of the Custom of Early Morning Communion," is mainly a discussion of Pliny's famous letter to Trajan. The conclusion is once again inadequately based; the author is so much struck by the paradox of commemorating a supper in the early morning that he has not noticed the yet more important paradox involved in shewing forth on Sunday a death which actually occurred on Friday. The solution of the latter might have helped him in his attempt to account for the former.

E. GRAHAM.

CIVILIZATION REMADE BY CHRIST. By F. A. M. Spencer, B.D. George
Allen and Unwin. 7s. 6d.

This book is in some sense a sequel to Mr. Spencer's *The Ethics of the Gospel*, and endeavours to point out the lines along which our Lord's ethical teaching may be applied to some of the most pressing problems of our own time. Among these are War, Politics, the treatment of crime and vices (where the author's own experience as a Prison Chaplain adds force and interest to his argument), the stewardship of wealth, and the

spiritual value of education. All the chapters show wide reading and patient thinking, if not inspiration. The most interesting part of the book is the group of three chapters on Marriage, the Family, and the Eugenic Problem. In the first of these we have the familiar but misleading stress on hard cases; and the third contains a bad example (p. 236) of a tendency which may be suspected throughout the book—of claiming Dominical sanction for some advocated practice without justification; but the second is valuable and impressive.

Two good sentences in the introductory chapter indicate the writer's outlook. "Our Lord," he says, "demands our obedience and encourages our freedom"; and again the "transient particularity" of this ethic "shews forth its imperishable universality."

E. GRAHAM.

THE PRINCIPLES OF RELIGIOUS CEREMONIAL. By Walter Howard Frere, D.D. Second edition. Mowbray. 7s. 6d.

In the twenty-three years which have passed since the first edition of this book, much work has been done in the study of liturgies and the application of correct liturgical principles to the Anglican formularies; the Alcuin Club in particular, of which the Bishop of Truro is a leading spirit, has produced a considerable volume of work, ranging from the publication of Edwardian inventories and Elizabethan visitations to strictly practical directories of ceremonial.

Dr. Frere's book, however, remains the best *rationale*. If one asks not *what* is done, or *how*, but *why*, and desires an historical and philosophical key to Christian liturgiology in general and to the practice of the *Ecclesia Anglicana* in particular, both before and after the Reformation, the answer is to be found here. Too many liturgiologists, both of our own and of the Roman Church, have looked upon ceremonial with a purely Western eye: Dr. Frere's intimate knowledge of Orthodox practice, both that of the early centuries (see Chapter V., new in this edition) and at the present day, enables him to regard and explain these subjects from a more truly Catholic outlook, I venture to say, than a "Westerner" alone, even though such Westerner be familiar with the rites of Salisbury, Milan, and Toledo.

He has at the same time dropped a couple of now superfluous chapters: the argument for the *jus liturgicum* is now admitted by all reasonable people, and the Anglo-Catholic interpretation of the Ornaments Rubric is accepted in the most unlikely quarters.

We welcome the new edition most heartily. It should be studied in theological colleges, and by both clergy and laity who have either to put ceremonial into practice or desire to express public opinion on what used to be called "ritualism." And if there is ever another attempt at prayer-book revision in our day, the revisers, of all degrees of the hierarchy, should be made to pass a searching examination on this book before they enter their conclaves!

STEPHEN GASELEE.

PYRRHŌ. By Bartram Tollinton. Sheldon Press. 4s. 6d.

To be quoted by a Bampton lecturer, in connection with a technical theological subject, always gives to an author the right of claiming a

scholarly knowledge of his particular period. Dr. Tollinton has this distinction. Dr. Williams, in his Bampton Lectures, makes a reference to his excellent book on Clement of Alexandria, and *Pyrrho* may be termed a spiritual *Æneid* of the Clementine era. It lacks all the weak apologia of most modern spiritual *Æneids*.

Pyrrho is a young Alexandrian, living under the intelligently blasé rule of the Emperor Septimus Severus. The history opens with a charming account of Pyrrho's return to Alexandria, after a long sea journey. He is, we are told, seeking peace for his soul, a peace which he discovers, as did Petronius and Apuleius before him, does not come from a nominal worship of fashionable gods. He is to marry Didyme, daughter of a pagan Monica and a harsh, business-like father, but he notices that she has become strangely alienated from him. He finds her studying a roll of papyrus, which he reads and cannot understand. It is neither Epicurean nor Stoic. The Jesus of whom it speaks is unknown to him (not a very likely contingency in Alexandria at this period). Also he has never heard of a writer called Markos.

He goes with his difficulties to the Kirjath-sepher of one Omar, a character attractively reminiscent of Anatole France's "Sylvestre Bonnard" where, in an atmosphere of books and copyists, he learns that Markos is the peasant biographer of the Christian Man-God. Here he is introduced, for the first time, to the writing of the brilliantly eclectic Clement. Mr. Tollinton is singularly accurate in his résumé of the theological speculations of the head of the Catechetical School of Alexandria. He shows well the inevitable struggle which every intelligent interpreter of the Christian writings must endure at the hands of emotional literalists. He draws the character of Tertullian as a learnedly bitter lawyer, attacking Clement's liberal thought, which he is unable to comprehend. We are taken into the very life of a controversial Alexandria.

So attracted is Pyrrho that he goes to hear Clement lecture, and finds it increasingly difficult to discover a *point de liaison* between him and Mark. During his period of intellectual uncertainty he is brought from the noumenal to the real by the arrival of Severus, accompanied by Julia Domna and Antoninus, in Alexandria. The Emperor, against his will, is forced by the jealous pagan professors of the Museum to issue his rescript putting Christians on a legal level with the Jews. It becomes a criminal offence to become a Christian after the rescript has been promulgated. As this action of the Emperor is the occasion leading to the climax, Dr. Tollinton appears to me to trifle with the historic Muse in ignoring the work of Neumann, Neander, and Ramsay, who either treat the edict as non-existent or find it very difficult of explanation. The short account in *Ælius Spartianus* on Severus is completely ambiguous.

In the persecution which follows, Leonides, father of Origen, suffers martyrdom. Didyme and Rhoda, her Christian nurse, escape from Alexandria. Pyrrho goes to Rome as the secretary of Severus, where he is implicated in the plot of the sycophant Plautian against the life of the Emperor. He is acquitted, and continues his *Æneid* along a new path set for him by the gnostic Festa, who tells him of the life of Apollonius of Tyana. The dénouement is unexpected.

The book is attractively written. It is accurate, not only in the description of the personalities and work of famous historical characters, but also—an unusual quality in the modern theological novel—in details.

The account of the trial is an excellent example of this. Dr. Tollinton obviously knows a great deal about Alexandria and of the people who lived in it during the second and third centuries.

C. W. R. SQUIRE.

EDMUND RICH, ARCHBISHOP AND SAINT. By M. R. Newbolt. S.P.C.K. 5s.

St. Edmund Rich was a good patriot but a bad Primate. Of mediæval saints he is one of the least sympathetic. To the temper of modern Anglicanism his extravagant austerities are as repellent as his mystical experiences are unfamiliar. His piety and learning are beyond dispute. But elderly dons seldom make good administrators. The mind of St. Edmund was ill-balanced; he could never understand or tolerate opposition to his extremely arbitrary will; in consequence, such of the revenues of his see as were not squandered upon demoralizing liberality were swallowed by protracted litigation. In money matters he was always hopelessly incompetent. In matters of policy he was impractical. Whenever he strove to assert the liberties of the English Church he always jeopardized them. He drove Henry III. into the arms of the Pope; he obstructed the necessary reforms initiated by the Legate Otho; and finally, confronted with the consequences of his intransigence, he protested, submitted, and retired (like Becket) to Pontigny to salve his wounded dignity, abandoning his clergy to their fate. Yet throughout his primacy his staunch, if narrow, patriotism had made him a leader of the popular resistance to Poitevin counsellors and Italian priests; and therefore, when he died in exile, the voice of the people insisted that he be canonized. The King of France, Louis IX. himself, concurred in the demand. National consciousness, in that moment, became half articulate; it was but a step to the Avignon Captivity on the one hand, and to the English Reformation on the other.

Such is the significance, in Anglican tradition, of the life of Edmund Rich. The Papacy, in its efforts to finance its Holy War against the Hohenstaufen, had overreached itself; the milch cow kicked. Rightly or wrongly, the primacy of St. Edmund was interpreted by his contemporaries in the light of the Berkshire Rectors' Protest; chronologically, therefore, he is in a sense the first saint of the Church of England.

Yet these considerations are but faintly adumbrated by Mr. Newbolt. St. Edmund's primacy is dismissed in thirty pages with the observation: "Any attempt to write the story of those seven years at all adequately would take one deeper into English history than this little book cares to venture." For the remaining 120 pages the author wanders in the humourless paths of hagiography, with long, if well-informed, digressions upon such topics as Mediæval Universities, the Moors in Spain, the topography of mediæval Oxford, or the rise of Gothic architecture. There are two misprints: "Laycock" (p. 87) should be "Lacock," and "Henry II." on p. 103 should be "Henry III." The illustrations, particularly the pen-and-ink sketches after Matthew Paris, are admirable, and as an introduction to the civilization of the thirteenth century this little book, though rambling and discursive and tainted with old-fashioned Whiggism, possesses considerable merits; but as a biography of St. Edmund Rich it is inadequate.

C. H. SMYTH.

MEN AND MOVEMENTS IN THE CHURCH

A Series of Interviews

By the Rev. F. A. IREMONGER

Vicar of Vernham Dean; formerly Editor of *The Guardian*.

Crown 8vo. Paper covers, 8s. 6d. net; cloth, 4s. 6d. net

Among those interviewed are:

The Archbishop-Designate of York
(Dr. Temple).

The Dean of Canterbury.

The Rev. H. R. L. Sheppard.

Lord Hugh Cecil.

The Bishop-Designate of Manchester

(Dr. Guy Warman).

The Bishop of St. Albans.

The Bishop of Birmingham.

Dean Inge.

The Rev. G. A. Studdert-Kennedy.

Dr. Cyril Norwood, Headmaster of Harrow.

The Rev. Prebendary Wilson Carlile.

The Rev. P. T. B. Clayton.

Dr. Joseph Wells, Warden of Wadham.

THE SHINING MYSTERY OF JESUS

By the Rev. DOUGLAS EDWARDS, M.A., Exeter College, Oxford.

With an Introduction by the Rt. Rev. WILLIAM TEMPLE, Archbishop-Designate of York.

Imp. 16mo 6s. net.

ESSAYS ON THE TRINITY AND THE INCARNATION

By MEMBERS OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION. Edited by the Rev. A. E. J. RAWLINSON, D.D., Student of Christ Church, Oxford.

8vo. 21s. net.

AND WAS MADE MAN:

An Introduction to the Study of the Gospels

By the Rev. LEONARD HODGSON, M.A., Professor of Christian Apologetics in the General Theological Seminary, New York.

8vo. 9s. net.

THE INCARNATE LORD

An Essay concerning the Doctrine of the Incarnation in its Relation to Organic Conceptions

By the Rev. LIONEL S. THORNTON, M.A., of the Community of the Resurrection.

8vo. 21s. net.

[Ready October 18th.]

THE NEW LEARNING AND THE OLD FAITH

By the Rev. ARTHUR W. ROBINSON, D.D., Canon of Canterbury.

Crown 8vo. Paper covers, 2s. 6d. net; cloth, 3s. 6d. net.

PAROCHIAL MISSIONS TO-DAY

A Handbook of Evangelistic Missions for Missioners and Parochial Clergy

By the Rev. PETER GREEN, M.A., Rector of St. Philip's, Salford, and Canon of Manchester.

Crown 8vo. Paper covers, 2s. 6d. net; cloth, 4s. net.

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., LTD., 39, Paternoster Row, London, E.C.4

S. P. C. K.

New and Forthcoming Books

ESSAYS CATHOLIC AND MISSIONARY

Edited by E. R. MORGAN. Cloth boards (approximate price 7s. 6d.)

AUTHORS:

ROBERT H. BAKER
C. H. BOUTFLOWER, Bishop of Southampton
LAURENCE E. BROWNE
GODFREY CALLAWAY
W. J. CLISSOLD
MOTHER EDITH
H. H. KELLY
H. A. JONES

P. H. LLOYD, Asst. Bishop of Bombay
W. V. LUCAS, Bishop of Masasi
E. R. MORGAN
E. L. STRONG
REGINALD TRIBE
M. N. TROLLOPE, Bishop in Corea
EVELYN UNDERHILL
STACY WADDY

[November]

ENGLISH ECCLESIASTICAL STUDIES

By ROSE GRAHAM. With illustrations. Cloth boards, 15s. net.

Among them are:

THE RELATION OF CLUNY TO SOME OTHER MOVEMENTS OF MONASTIC REFORM.
THE ENGLISH PROVINCE OF THE ORDER OF CLUNY IN THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY.
THE PRIORY OF LA CHARITÉ-SUR LOIRE AND THE MONASTERY OF BERMONDSEY.
THE TAXATION OF POPE NICHOLAS IV.

THE SPIRIT OF WISDOM, LOVE AND POWER

Instructions and Material for Meditation. By PAUL B. BULL, C.R.
Paper cover, 1s. 6d. Duxeen boards, 2s. 6d. net.

ANTE-NICENE EXEGESIS OF THE GOSPELS

Vol. IV. By HAROLD SMITH, D.D. (Translations of Christian Literature.) Cloth boards, 7s. 6d. net.

THE NESTORIAN MONUMENT IN CHINA

(Reprint.) By P. Y. SAEKI. With eight illustrations. Cloth boards, 12s. 6d. net.

This fascinating book, written by an eminent Japanese scholar, was published during the War in a limited edition which was soon sold out. The monument is the chief evidence for early Christianity in China. The inscription is given in Chinese and English with a great deal of illustrative matter.

HOMES OF THE PSALMS

Their Original Meaning and Structure Illustrated by the Surroundings in which they were first used. By STACY WADDY, M.A., Secretary of S.P.G. With four plans. Cloth boards, 6s. net.

THE BIBLE AND THE MODERN MIND

By VERNON F. STORR, M.A. (Churchman's Popular Library.) Limp duxeen, 1s. Cloth boards, 1s. 6d. net.

A clear treatment in small compass of the Nature and Origin of the Bible, its human and divine elements, and the best methods of study, which will be of great help to students and especially to those who have to teach the Bible.

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE

LONDON: Northumberland Avenue, W.C. 2

And of all Booksellers

Lists post free.

STUDENT CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT

THE FAITH THAT REBELS

A Re-examination of the Miracles of Jesus.

By D. S. CAIRNS, D.D., Principal of U.F.C. College, Aberdeen.

Author of "The Reasonableness of the Christian Faith," etc.

"At last we have a book on miracles which really moves the problem out of the stalemate into which it has fallen."—*The Guardian*. 8s. 6d. net.

A BIBLICAL THOROUGHFARE

An Endeavour to share the Main Results of Biblical Scholarship with the General Public.

By N. S. TALBOT, D.D., Bishop of Pretoria. 7s. 6d. net.

THE GOSPEL OF GOD

[In the press.]

By HERBERT KELLY, Society of the Sacred Mission, Kelham.

4s. net. Paper Covers, 2s. 6d. net.

SPIRITUAL DIRECTION

An Essay in Pastoral Theology in the Light of Present-day Needs.

By CANON T. W. PYM, M.A., D.S.O.

Author of "Psychology and the Christian Life," etc. 5s. net.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF CHRISTIAN FAITH

Selections from the writings of the late Gaston Frömmel.

Edited by J. VERNON BARTLET, D.D., Mansfield College, Oxford.

Translated from the French by J. MACARTNEY WILSON, D.D. 7s. 6d. net.

WRITE FOR NEW AUTUMN LIST OF BOOKS

32 RUSSELL SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.1

A LITERARY HISTORY OF RELIGIOUS THOUGHT IN FRANCE FROM THE WARS OF RELIGION DOWN TO OUR OWN TIMES

Volume I, Devout Humanism

By HENRI BREMOND. Translated by K. L. MONTGOMERY.

8 $\frac{1}{2}$ x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$. 448 pp. Cloth boards. 16s. net. (November.)

THIS work, the first volume of which was published in Paris in 1916 under the title "Histoire Littéraire du Sentiment Religieux en France," has been recognised by discriminating readers as belonging to the few recent books really deserving the title "great." It traces the course of French religious literature from Richeome (1544-1625) to Yves de Paris and the struggle with Jansenism. To the English reader unfamiliar with the subject the study of this book is a veritable revelation. The theologians, biographers, hagiographers, novelists, poets, and humorists here described contain a wealth of culture which no contemporary nation could remotely approach. A world of learning and culture is here displayed, to make the acquaintance of which would be well worth while, even if a great effort were required in order to understand it. As it is, the architectural skill and the literary grace of the Abbé Bremond are such that the book is as easy as it is delightful to read.

S.P.C.K., London

ENGLISH CHURCH UNION

THE ENGLISH CHURCH UNION still maintains the unique position which it has occupied for seventy years in the Catholic Movement.

It devotes its enormous resources to the steadfast defence of Catholic Doctrine and Discipline, and persists in upholding the claim of the Church of England to be an integral part of the whole Catholic Church of Christ.

It has devoted itself, through its Literature Committee, to the production of literature in all branches of Theology and Ethics.

A One Volume Catholic Commentary on the whole Bible, which ought to be of invaluable service to the cause, will be published this year.

The Second Edition of "The Catechism of Catholic Faith and Practice" (S.P.C.K., 2d.) is now ready.

The Union, through its Legal Committee and by means of its great financial resources, is able to afford counsel, protection and assistance to all persons, lay or clerical, who may be oppressed in any spiritual matter.

In all its activities the Union seeks to co-operate with all other Catholic Societies, and looks forward hopefully to the day when all such Societies may be united and work together under one leadership for the support of Catholic Principles and Practice.

Conditions of Membership: Membership is open to all members of the Church of England and of Churches in Communion with her who are communicants, and the membership is graduated as follows: Full Members, 10/- a year; Associates, 2/6; and Adherents, 1/-.

The Church Union Gazette is published monthly at the incredibly low price of 1/6 per annum, post free.

ARNOLD PINCHARD,

Secretary.

31, Russell Square, W.C. 1.